REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 604 24
FOREIGN AREA STUDIES IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION.
BY- GUMPERZ, ELLEN M.
CALIFORNIA UNIV., BERKELEY, CTR.FOR STUDY HI. ED.
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0248 PUB DATE SEP 66
REPORT NUMBER PROJECT-C-07
CONTRACT OEC-6-10-106
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.52 88P.

DESCRIPTORS- *AREA STUDIES, HIGHER EDUCATION, *INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, FOREIGN CULTURE, FOREIGN COUNTRIES, *FOREIGN RELATIONS, *COLLEGE PROGRAMS, LANGUAGE, DEVELOPING NATIONS, WORLD PROBLEMS, *HISTORICAL REVIEWS, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE 20TH-CENTURY MATURATION OF FOREIGN AREA STUDY CURRICULUMS IN U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WAS DESCRIBED. THE DESCRIPTION ACCOUNTED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TWO RELATED FACETS OF AREA STUDIES--GENERAL EDUCATION AND APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT. GENERAL AREA STUDY WOULD USUALLY CONSIST OF COURSES IN VARIOUS DISCIPLINES OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, FOCUSING ON PAST AND PRESENT CHARACTERISTICS OF A PARTICULAR WORLD AREA AND INCLUDING A COURSE IN THE MODERN LANGUAGE OR LANGUAGES OF THAT AREA. APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WOULD PERTAIN TO TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN SUCH FIELDS AS AGRICULTURE, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND EDUCATION, AND WOULD USUALLY INVOLVE WORKING DIRECTLY WITH U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND COOPERATIVELY WITH OTHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS. (JH)

ED010604

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

5-0248

INTERIM REPORT
Project No. C-07
Contract No. OE-6-10-106

FOREIGN AREA STUDIES IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

September 1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FOREIGN AREA STUDIES IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Project No. C-07
Contract No. OE-6-10-106

Ellen M. Gumperz

September 1966

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Berkeley, California

Introduction

Foreign area studies as a curriculum concept is now well into its middle age. Born of the First World War, it had a timid and understimulated childhood in the thirties, when attempts to organize "foreign" (that is, non-European and non-North American) fields of study are properly classed largely as labors of love, rewarded more by the satisfaction of performing them than by any great light shed. A forced adolescence followed, precipitated by the Second World War, which brought forth urgent demands that American higher education take the unanticipated responsibility of producing relatively fully developed programs in both foreign language training and foreign cultures. The general feeling on the part of those who had to improvise these programs on anything from a few weeks' to six months' notice was that American higher education had been found woefully lacking in its knowledge of foreign cultures and that this was a condition which could not be allowed to persist.

The nineteen-fifties saw the maturation of foreign area studies. It came to be agreed that a foreign area program was a planned attempt to provide a group of courses in various disciplines of the humanities and social sciences focussing largely on a particular world area, past and present; the teaching

---

The research reported here was carried out pursuant to the terms of U. S. Office of Education contract # OE 6-10-106, in the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. Research on the hearings preceding the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and subsequent enabling legislation was done by Gail M. Omvedt. Bibliography was compiled by Jan Brukman and William Boyd; the latter also compiled information on foreign area studies programs and their sources of support which appears in the Appendix, tabulated returns on a questionnaire survey of 21 inter-institutional cooperative programs in foreign area studies. I am extremely grateful to all of them for their aid. The author is, of course, solely responsible for the views expressed here and for any shortcomings in the report.

of the modern spoken language of the area came to be a fixed feature of such programs. Foreign area specialists, often with bureaucratic experience derived from their wartime participation in the Departments of State, War, Army or Navy, settled down after 1945 to calling conferences to plan development strategy and to enlist foundation support. For most area studies administrators, the 1950s were a time of writing applications for Foundation grants, and exercise which brought forth unaccustomed fruits. Departments whose studies dealt largely or only with America and Western Europe watched in awe, sometimes even rather enviously, as financial plums seemed to rain upon area studies programs.

But even the generosity of the leading Foundations could not accomplish what was now seen as the task of "internationalizing" American higher education. In a clear case of academic escalation, the Foundation funds fed into these programs only enhanced the need for more. Accordingly the Federal government gingerly took a first step into direct support for higher education in 1958 with the National Defense Education Act. While Title IV of this act provided support for various categories of university students, Title VI offered direct support to university "centers" of foreign language and area study for those areas and languages defined as being of "critical interest" to United States policy-making.

We are now almost a decade into an era in which the activities of institutions of higher education both in areas outside United States boundaries and concerning foreign areas have come to be seen as serving the national interest in particular, definable ways. This view of education and foreign areas has had a major impact, both on higher education itself, and on higher education's relations with government. American higher education has taken on a series of entirely new ancillary activities which bridge the gap between government and academic institutions in that some of them, at least, are neither wholly academic, nor wholly in the field of implementation of policy. Rather, they partake of both. The first of these new ancillary activities, and also the most traditionally academic of them, was foreign area studies programs. They were followed by applied research in particular foreign areas themselves on matters of agricultural development, public health, and so forth. The final step has been widespread contractual undertakings between universities and various branches of government (of whom AID comes most prominently to mind) for programs of technical and economic assistance to foreign countries, such as institution-to-institution cooperation in developing universities in various countries.

These new activities have necessitated administrative reorganization in the academic institutions themselves to carry the necessary burdens of review of proposed projects, budgeting, administration of the contracts, and university relations with government. The organizations which have appeared to carry out these enhanced functions are usually known as Institutes or Centers for International Studies; and existing foreign area studies programs in the institutions concerned have usually been placed, however loosely, under the purview of these institutes or centers. This means that area studies, in the universities at least, have gained a new context. They now join numerous other projects, many of them more oriented to government service than to any purely academic purpose of teaching or research, in writing for the government as well as the local academic institution their proposed budgets and technical reports.

Federal support, in addition, has focussed national attention on the so-called "international dimension of education"; and the sixties has been a period of assessments of Federal programs and the appointment of national committees to make policy recommendations on international education. Government contracting procedures with the universities have been reviewed and criticized; careful financial reports on the results of federal stimulation to area programs have been drawn up; administrative organization for international work in the universities has been assessed; policy advisory groups have discussed world affairs in the university and in the college. The net result of all this activity, as far as curriculum is concerned, has been to generalize, predictably, an interest in international education to almost all institutions of higher education. For most four-year institutions, an international program of some kind is almost required to assure a "modern" public image. Not surprisingly, the great bulk of the literature in the last ten years has been concerned with ways and means to add this component to an institution's program--and to add it with minimum dislocation all around, for institutions of higher education are generally conservative places.

Despite all this ferment, the discussion of foreign area studies programs shows surprisingly little awareness of issues. Issues are discussed either in very general terms or in fragmentary asides without much elaboration. General issues tend to be phrased so broadly as to preclude fruitful discussions; for example; "How can foreign area studies be fitted into the curriculum in such a way that students obtain a good grounding in both their own culture and in one or more foreign areas too?" As this is a question which includes both curriculum planning and institutional organization, it is apparent that little headway can be made until these issues are separated.

Similarly, although the fragmentary asides often contain the germs of sound analysis, these analyses have been left in so undeveloped a state that they have attracted little attention.

A review of the literature at this time may well serve the purpose of flushing some of these issues from the plentiful underbrush of verbiage which has grown up about foreign area studies in higher education. In tracing the changing role which these curricular programs have played in academic life, we will focus at all times upon the relationship of organization and content. It will be our object to show why foreign area studies programs have taken the forms they have assumed and what their impact has been upon the organization of knowledge in American higher education.

* * *

Early Development

Foreign area studies in America has been the child of politics. Area studies, it is said, grew out of the First World War, when our ignorance of foreign areas was first brought forcibly to public attention. If this is the case, it is difficult to see why the first foreign area programs were Latin American ones. Interest in these programs, however, diminished during the 1920s; and the focus of the scattered developments by the end of the twenties shifted to Asia, particularly the Far East, in apparent response to worrisome political developments there. Thus it was that Orientalism became the parent of modern area studies in America.

Orientalism was Classicism of a particular kind. As Charles Ferguson has remarked,

> The Orientalist tradition, which is. . . the background from which (Middle Eastern,) South Asian, East Asian, and Southeast Asian area studies have emerged in the United States, is a curious

> amalgam of interests in philology, archaeology, history of religion, and other fields as applied to the great civilizations of Asia. Scholars who call themselves Orientalists feel they belong to a special discipline: They are not historians, linguists, art critics, or philosophers as such but rather they represent the whole range of the humanities in dealing with the Orient.

In actual fact, however, Orientalists, like other Classicists, have not found it possible to be general humanists; rather,

> The Orientalist tradition. . . has been historical in outlook. . . and inclined to constitute a small, exclusive club of scholars for which the initiation fee included acquaintance with exotic, dead Asian languages.

This was the academic seedbed to area studies not only in the United States, but in Britain as well; it was a well developed mentality of international scholarship which clearly modelled itself on the 19th century study of classical Greece and Rome, though the original Classicism even in the 1920s was in full retreat before the development of professional historians, anthropologists, and political scientists. In all the countries where Orientalism was current, as Sir Hamilton Gibb has pointed out, the results were large compilations of factual data but limited analysis, and a disregard of both diverse local traditions and underlying economic and social factors in favor of high literary culture. With these went a disinterest in "matters purely pedogogical" so marked that the compilation of even dictionaries of many Asian languages was thought unnecessary, and an emphasis in course offerings on Asia on the ancient world at the expense of the modern Orient so strong that in the 1940s more American universities offered courses in Old Persian, the language of the fifth century B.C., than in Modern Persian, the language of the twentieth century A.D.[1]

The credit for the whatever limited development of Far Eastern Studies occurred during the thirties can be laid at the door of two organizations, one a Foundation (the Rockefeller Foundation), the other a well-known academic clearing house (the American Council of Learned Societies). The history of the development suggests the very considerable degree to which area studies were dependent upon extra-local and extra-disciplinary organizations for support from the very start. The president of the American Political Science Association had proposed a discussion of methods of instruction and research in the Chinese field as early as 1920, but this proposal was not implemented until the American Council of Learned Societies established a permanent secretariat and executive offices in 1927. The establishment of this machinery presented an opportunity "for extending the Council's activities effectively into those fields, such as Far-Oriental studies, which do not come immediately within the purview of any of its constituent societies or whose exploitation requires the collaboration of a number of them."[2]

Accordingly, the ACLS proposed in 1928 a survey of the state of research on the Far East; this was endorsed by the American Oriental Society, an association known then as now for its association with classicist Orientalism.[3] Memos circularizing the field were followed by a conference on China studies, the first of its kind to be held in America, on October 6, 1928. This meeting called for a survey of organization and resources for research and instruction in Chinese studies; a directory of Sinologists the world over; the compilation of bibliographies; money for scholarships and fellowships; and the formation of an ACLS Committee on Chinese Studies (accomplished in early 1929).[4] Those attending were urged also to propagandize the importance of China studies in universities and colleges throughout the country.

The Committee on Chinese Studies selected Charles S. Gardner to review the library resources for Chinese studies available in the United States, a task which he carried out in a series of surveys in the early 1930s. These investigations revealed a large Library of Congress collection, a good private collection in Montreal (The Gest Library), and another at Harvard; but "turning from Montreal, Cambridge and Washington," Gardner found it "rather a shock to find, among all the great cities and universities elsewhere on the Atlantic seaboard, the Central West, and the Pacific Coast, no single comprehensive Chinese Library."[5]

The ACLS' publicizing activities were materially aided by the appearance in 1929 by the first example of a type of literature which was to become abundant in the early 1950s. This was a survey of courses on China and Japan in college and university curricula conducted in 1927-28 by Edward C. Carter of the University of Chicago for the Institute of Pacific Relations' American Council. Carter asked 546 accredited institutions to list the courses with "major emphasis" on China and/or Japan which appeared in their catalogs, apparently regardless of whether they were regularly taught or not. Of the 443 institutions which responded (slightly over 81%), only 111 (just under 22% of the total) reported any courses at all. Of them, the majority (69 institutions) reported one course, 33 reported two to five courses, four reported six to ten courses, and five reported 11 to 26 courses. The nine leading institutions were Washington (Seattle), with 26 courses; California (Berkeley) with 25 courses; Harvard (16 courses); Stanford (15 courses); Columbia (13 courses); Chicago and Pennsylvania (10 courses each); and Minnesota and Radcliffe College (6 courses each). The courses were, moreover, heavily concentrated in universities; only 15% of liberal arts colleges reported any courses on China or Japan and almost no teachers' colleges or junior colleges. The dominance of Orientalism and returned missionaries among China Scholars was seen clearly in the nature of the courses taught; 54 % of the courses listed were in history or political science, 14% were in language and literature, and 11% in philosophy and religion (of which 9% concerned religion alone); all other fields accounted for no more than 5% each of the courses given.[6]

Carter's book also included short sketches of the leading departments of Chinese studies which clearly demonstrate, whether intentionally or not, the large element of the accidental and philanthropic in what China studies there were. Columbia University had acquired a department of Chinese in 1901 as a memorial established by General Horace W. Carpentier to the memory of his Chinese servant. The University of California at Berkeley had received a gift of 50 acres of land from Senator Edward Tompkins in 1876 whose sale was to form the endowment for a chair of Oriental languages. The object of this gift was to aid business with the Orient by equipping Americans with facility in Chinese. Interest at Chicago was aroused by summer institutes on the Far East Financed by the Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation. Harvard-Yenching institute was the gift of an aluminum magnate, Charles M. Hall. And so it went.

Carter's work provided ammunition for a decade of dutiful propagandizing efforts by scholars and administrators alike.[7] This genre forms the bulk of the material on area studies and persists until today, though its subject matter has been broadened from the original promotion of Chinese studies to include all of Asia, Africa, Latin America, "underdeveloped areas," "foreign area studies" in general, and finally, "international education." The object has been to bring the need for such studies to the attention, not primarily of the general public, but of administrators of various kinds of institutions of higher education who have been reluctant, for various reasons, to enrich their curricula with these studies.

As a result of Carter's work and a report of its own[8] the ACLS took more concrete steps to remedy these conditions by financing a summer seminar in Far Eastern Studies for faculty members of any accredited institution on the Harvard campus in 1932. To the astonishment of the ACLS planners, one hundred applications flooded in; only forty could be accepted. The course followed familiar lines and concentrated upon general history, history of oriental philosophy, and oriental art, with voluntary courses in Chinese and Japanese language.[9] A second summer seminar designed for "instructors and assistant professors with no experience in Far Eastern Studies" was held on the Berkeley campus in 1934 under the same auspices, while Harvard in the same summer offered what was apparently an early intensive course in Russian for faculty members.[10]

The impact of these activities on the academic world at large may be gauged by a glance at a report on the state of a discipline intimately involved in Far Eastern Studies. Historical Scholarship in America: Needs and Opportunities, (1932), is the result of the work of a Committee set up in December 1930 by the American Historical Association with the support of the Social Science Research Council and the ACLS to "convene advisory conferences of specialists in the main branches of historical investigation." The Committee set up conferences in ancient, medieval and modern European history and two American history meetings, but regretted that it was unable to do the same for Oriental or Latin American history. The Committee's report does, however, urge the need for mastery of "neglected languages" in order to extend graduate research to "neglected areas"; among the languages neglected because of their difficulties were listed Spanish, Slavic languages, Arabic and Chinese.[11] The Middle Kingdom and the Middle East had at least been recognized as the fringes of the historical world; Japan, all of Southern Asia, and Africa were apparently excluded.

Ten years after China had engaged the attention of the ACLS it turned to the study of India. While it is true that in 1930 the ACLS had taken over from the American Oriental Society a Committee on Indic and Iranian studies, this group was composed entirely of Sanskritists whose concern was not to develop the field of Indic studies but to organize an American School of Indic and Iranian studies which undertook one season's archaeological excavations in Northwestern India in 1935-36 and then quietly expired for lack of funds. This experience evidently alerted the Committee to the lack of support available to India studies and convinced the members that some public education on the subject was needed. Thus in 1939 the Committee undertook a survey of the condition of Indic studies in America.

The problem of Indic studies was even more explicitly that of detaching the study of India from Orientalism; and it was a much more academic matter than China studies. China by now had become a major focus in world politics; it had for some time been an important field for both American business and American missionary effort, stimulating public interest directly, rather than indirectly through the universities.[12] Moreover close association between high-level diplomatic service and scholarship on China characterized the lives of China specialists in the 1920s.[13] None of these conditions existed for India. It was outside the reading public's political interest and outside the commercial public's trading interests. As the ACLS Bulletin on Indic Studies in America admitted,

> At present, only the sheerest accident brings India into the purview of the American college student. Eight universities (Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Johns-Hopkins, Pennsylvania, Chicago and California) have chairs of Indology or Sanskrit,

> but India is virtually unrepresented in departments of history, philosophy, fine arts, political science, sociology, or any of the other departments of intellectual experience in which. . . India has made great contributions.[14]

The writer, one W. Norman Brown (now the oldest active South Asia specialist in the United States), called for a program of joint training by Indologists and the disciplines, with placement of the students so prepared in disciplinary departments; such training would require as a normal element a period of residence and training in India requiring "fellowship aid of a kind beyond the power of any university at present."[15]

The survey of teaching on India accompanying Brown's essay bore out his contention; coursework on India was confined to Sanskrit, surveys of Indian civilization taught by Sanskritists; philosophy and religion; or history taught as an aspect of British empire history. But the survey of library collections showed the research situation to be far more drastic than in the China case. Where Gardner had rated as "good" libraries containing 80,000 to 150,000 volumes on China, he found a collection of some 40,000 volumes "painfully inadequate in many respects," and a private library of some 20,000 volumes was asserted to be "the only collection worthy of the name in the Midwest."[16] But Horace Poleman, the Library of Congress' South Asia man, writing some ten years after the China survey, rated as "good" collections of from 3,000 to 5,000 volumes on India.[17]

Second World War Watershed

Soon after the appearance of this document, the outbreak of World War II put a stop to these timid attempts to develop the Asian fields and turned the attention of both the public and the academic world to other problems. Up to this time, the Rockefeller Foundation through the ACLS had put something under $1 million into the development of area studies. A recent review of the role of the Foundations in this field comments that "these dollars were well invested as they helped to create the kind of competence that was so sorely needed during the period of World War II. But not enough money was invested for these purposes by American philanthropy as a whole."[18]

The need for more knowledge of foreign areas was soon dramatically brought to the attention of American universities by the request of the Government that they assume responsibility for the training of American servicemen in language and area knowledge for duty in military government in the soon-to-be occupied countries. Within nine months after the entrance of the United States into the war, 18 colleges and universities had organized programs for a projected 2,000 servicemen; by the end of 1944, some 57 institutions and 15,000 servicemen had been involved in one of the most remarkable educational experiments in the history of American higher education, and one that has had manifold repercussions. Briefly, the universities and colleges were requested by the military, as an act of national service in an emergency, to organize short-term intensive training programs on the basis of curricula evolved by academics consulting with the Departments of Army, Navy, and War. The areas covered were those which the American army, on the basis of agreements between heads of the various states involved in the war, expected to occupy (Scandinavia, Germany, France, Japan, Southeast Asia, and China), or was then using as staging areas. Not only did the universities and colleges agree; many of them jumped at the opportunity.

The programs which the institutions were asked to organize, however, differed in major ways from ordinary academic training programs. This was because the goals of the program differed very considerably from those of conventional academic courses, in that the trainees needed to gain facility in spoken, not written, languages; and they required a level of general cultural information about foreign areas which could not be found in courses based on an area's high literary culture. The fact of a national emergency fortunately precluded any arguments about whether these were legitimate materials to be taught at the college level, and about whether it was the proper work for professors to do so. But more important, these programs provided a heavensent opportunity for a new group of students of language who did not share the Classicists' view of language and language teaching. These were the structural linguists, whose techniques had been worked out during the 1930s, mainly on American Indian languages, but who were brought into the program through the efforts of Mortimer Graves, Executive Secretary of the ACLS.[19] For it was Graves, with generous Rockefeller backing, to whom the Army planners turned for guidance on the language training aspects of the program. Fortified by his experience in administering summer programs which attempted to teach Chinese, Japanese and Russian, by the work of ACLS in stimulating underrepresented areas of world study, and by his awareness of the new pedagogical techniques promised by descriptive linguistics, Graves, with J. Milton Cowan, Executive Secretary of the Linguistic Society of America, constructed an intensive spoken language training program which remains a distant grandparent of most of the postwar courses in the "neglected languages" found in American colleges and universities today.

The task of putting together a curriculum for area study from information scattered through eight or ten different disciplines fell to Harold W. Stoke, then professor of political science and Acting Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Wisconsin (later President of the University of New Hampshire). This proved substantially more difficult to accomplish and was the part of the program most often ignored or tampered with by the institutions involved. While the details of curriculum change in the programs need not detain us, it is important to note that they were largely successful in meeting their objectives, and most important, they were clearly exciting to the academic participants.[20] The programs suggested that a non-classicist approach to language study together with a non-literary approach to area study could be joined to yield useful information and suggestive new insights; they showed the possibility of circumventing what seemed to be immutable disciplinary boundaries crisscrossing the study of foreign areas; and they exposed the preoccupation of pre-War higher education with the American and Western European tradition.

Post War Ferment

But proponents of disciplinary boundaries as they stood in the mid-forties, classicists Eastern and Western, and proponents of liberal arts studies based primarily on American and Western European history and thought stood waiting in the wings. Immediately upon the cessation of hostilities a bitter argument broke out in the academic journals over the possible academic relevance of the wartime programs.

As this was a multi-faceted issue, the problems came piecemeal to academic attention. The first aspect of the wartime programs to be reviewed in the journals was modern language teaching, a subject which filled the columns of the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors for most of 1945.[21] Should teachers of modern languages, it was asked, turn from the traditional methods of teaching the literatures of these languages to the mechanical task of inculcating facility in speaking these languages? The details of this argument need not concern us, but the conclusion does; for the outcome of the discussion was a cautiously phrased recommendation:

> It may be that the study of literature should be preceded by mastery of the language, if there can be time to do it. . . . If academic foreign language departments find it feasible to give instruction in language before they give instruction in literature, the Army may indeed have worked a minor revolution in the teaching of the humanities.[22]

It is interesting to realize that within twenty years, these suggestions had become the standard program for the teaching of modern foreign languages at the college level.

Foreign area studies, however, could not be assured of a similar future, partly because the issues were more complex. As Milton Singer has pointed out, there was both intellectual and organization resistance to area studies programs.[23] On the level of organization, both proponents and opponents of foreign area studies realized that such programs would not fit easily into institutions organized into departments based, not on regions, but on fields of knowledge, or disciplines. To opponents of area programs, the opposition of the regional and disciplinary principles of institutional organization seemed a threat to the disciplinary departments, while to the proponents of area studies, the disciplinary departments posed a threat to area studies programs. More specifically, opponents of such programs feared that cross-departmental or cross-college cooperation required to focus instruction in several fields of knowledge upon a particular world region would weaken the authority of the units concerned while strengthening the power of the central administration; alternatively (and this was a very widespread concern), regular budgeting by collegiate institutions for expanding area studies programs was seen as a threat to the claims disciplinary departments could properly make upon the financial resources of the institution. Finally, opponents argued, such programs would provide a refuge for incompetents who could not make a success of scholarship in a discipline proper.[24]

To the most enthusiastic proponents of area studies, however, the threat they clearly posed to regular departmental organization appeared an opportunity to insert an entering wedge of organizational reform in an academia which had "gone to seed" in some respects through the over-rigidities of its internal divisions. These writers shared a general feeling that the disadvantages of departmental specialization had come to outweigh the advantages, defects which they felt that foreign area studies could both expose and remedy.[25] Observed W. N. Fenton, writing in 1947 for the Commission on Implications of Armed Services Educational Programs of the American Council on Education:

> Integrated area study threatens the regular departmental organization of the university since by its very nature it calls for a realignment of subject-matter fields and methodologies in order to concentrate them on the total civilization of a region. . . . By pointing to overlaps in the existing curriculum of concurrent courses and by revealing lacunae that exist between the disciplines, integrated area study accelerates the trend toward fewer courses in the liberal college. All /such/ threats to the reduction of the staff and the number of courses with a resultant drop in enrollments, loss of book fees, and decline in budget are resisted by heads of departments.[26]

Associated with this point of view was the belief that area studies posed a real intellectual alternative to the disciplines. It was argued that area studies could be considered a new kind of discipline with a body of knowledge defined by the geographical or cultural region upon which it was focussed and a methodology drawn from the methodologies of the contributing disciplines:

> The very methodology of integrated area study constitutes a challenge. In taking a functional view of contemporary civilizations, it jeopardizes the strong position which the historical method holds in academic thinking. . . . Besides relying heavily on the methods of the functional disciplines, integrated area study utilizes the comparative method. . . Integrated area study, then,

> may be defined as the focusing of all the disciplinary competences (geography, history, economics, language, and literature, philosophy, political science, and the like) upon a cultural area for the purpose of obtaining a total picture of that culture. A discipline must have a methodology and a body of knowledge. The latter is assured, and the former derives from the methodologies of participating competences which they do not possess uniquely.[27]

Some, not content with asserting area studies to be a new kind of discipline, attempted to construct a theory for it.[28] This kind of attempt to make foreign area studies respectable in the eyes of academia was motivated only partially by a sense of competition with established disciplines (though this was a strong element). There was also an honest concern on the part of some of these writers with the intellectual implications of the most popular current justifications for foreign area studies, which we may call the "national service" argument.

Those who justified area studies for their contribution to the country's national welfare were clearly appalled at the vast gaps in the information available to American academia revealed by the Second World War. They argued that the scholarship of the country had been found wanting in area knowledge when put to the test of war, and that for the sake of maintaining the peace, this must not be allowed to happen again. Drawing a comparison with the failure of interest in foreign areas after World War I, they urged their colleagues to establish area programs while interest was still strong and before an expected reversion to isolationism set in. Thus American academia could take the lead in dispelling public provincialism and would also perform a major service to the country by training future government servants to make better-informed decisions about foreign policy.[29]

This kind of talk found prompt endorsement in Washington, where it was soon pushed to extremes. A talk given before a group of educators in 1951 by the then Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath, makes it almost an act of treason for the universities not to undertake foreign area studies:

> Understanding of other peoples and cultures is fundamental to enlightened citizenship in our mid-century democracy. As long as we think about critical public issues and act on vital matters of public policy on the basis of false or inadequate information and stereotypes, we will do grave harm to our position in world affairs.[30]

The dangers of this point of view were apparent to Werner J. Cahnman, who warned as early as 1948 that unless area studies became academically respectable, they would too easily become "the chambermaid of politics"; he feared that area studies could be used as "a covering term for a more effective mapping of the world for the purpose of imperialistic penetration and ultimately of war" and would thus become a means of "bending science" to "motives that are extra-scientific and even antiscientific in character."[31]

But the claims for area studies as a discipline and the attempts at theory-building intended to displace the image of foreign area studies as an arm of government foreign policymaking did not go unchallenged. To the great majority of scholars in the disciplines contributing to area studies, foreign areas provided a field in which to demonstrate the general validity of the findings of the social science disciplines. Concludes a report of a conference convened by the Social Science Research Council in 1947 to consider foreign area research and training:

> Throughout the discussion of the objectives of area studies, whether on a theoretical or a practical level, it was implicit that area research must be a part of the empirical study of sociology, anthropology, economics, or another of the disciplines of the social sciences, of the humanities, or of the natural sciences. Research which is carried out in a foreign area must have bearing on the theoretical development of these sciences or disciplines, or on their generalizations. The aims of the universalization of social science and of interdisciplinary cooperation are not distinctive of area studies but are shared by all modern social science. . . . Area studies bring comparative and concrete data to bear on generalization and theory. . . ."[32]

Speaking more directly to the claims made for area studies as a discipline, George Peter Murdock warned in 1950:[33]

> For some time a tendency has been manifest seriously to exaggerate the scientific pretensions of area research. Unless such claims are pruned to realistic proportions, there is a danger that area programs may collapse in a welter of shattered hopes. When realistically viewed, area research cannot be expected to contribute directly to the advance of pure science in any of the disciplines concerned with human behavior. Like any scholarly activity, area research can contribute indirectly to the sciences dealing with man. . . . But to promote area studies as a major channel to the much-needed advance of fundamental social science is to promise something they cannot achieve.

While the cloud of controversy over foreign area studies undoubtedly served to prejudice many intelligent and respectable academics of various persuasions against them, it did serve to establish some points of departure. It showed first of all that the belief in area studies as a discipline was a product largely of the primitive development of some of the social sciences which contributed to area studies; and it effectively demonstrated that the weight of scholarly opinion favored development of the disciplines with case-study and comparative materials to be furnished by area research rather than abandoning the disciplines. Thus, seen as an intellectual challenge to the existing organization of knowledge, area studies were soon proved a failure.[34] But this did not mean there was no place for them in American higher education. On the contrary, there was general agreement that American higher education had concentrated too exclusively on the history and thought of North America and Western Europe; the hope was to generalize both American higher education and the principles of knowledge arrived at through the disciplines by adding materials on foreign areas. This left to be solved the more manageable problem of where in the organizational structure of colleges and universities to place foreign area studies programs.

But even more importantly, the argument that involvement with foreign areas of any sort on the part of institutions of higher education represented a national service was never really disposed of. The justifications applied to the wartime language and area programs continued to be applied to postwar area programs, mainly because they were useful tools in securing support for those who were quietly going about setting up area programs. Whatever they may have believed themselves, administrators of foreign area programs found it helpful to convince university administrators, boards of trustees, and foundations that national service was involved. Thus was created a habit of thinking (if not a precedent) which has had important consequences; for the rhetoric of national service which permitted educational institutions to ask for a share, first of foundation resources, then of national resources, for both instructional programs on the campus and research projects in other parts of the world, soon permitted the Government to respond by requesting the universities and colleges, in the name of national service, to lend their names and personnel to new and different projects in foreign areas under government auspices.

Planning Development in the 1950s

All this was yet to come, however, when in 1950 and 1951 educators interested in the development of foreign area studies sat down under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council to plan the development of a national policy for area studies. They defined their task as one dealing exclusively with graduate education. They acknowledged that "the principal problem which faces the universities is how they can serve the government's expanding need for personnel. . . without disrupting the highly important function of training research scholars"[35] and agreed that training for a proper competence in any area included "all the usual requirements for a Ph.D. in a discipline plus concentrated work on a world area"; language competence sufficient for research purposes, "integrated" background knowledge of the area, and field research.[36] Area Studies were not to displace disciplinary training, but to supplement it, though it was realized that this would add as much as three years to Ph.D. time requirements.[37] The products would be enabled to wear two hats as they chose: the scholar's cap or the administrator's fedora.

As early as 1946 the SSRC had commissioned Robert B. Hall to make a survey of existing area studies programs. Hall had visited 24 universities, where he found in operation 34 undergraduate area programs, 30 graduate area programs, and 13 research programs.[38] While Latin America, the Far East, Russia and American studies were well represented among them, there was very little interest in any other part of Europe, the Near East, Africa, India or Southeast Asia. Hall found 18 undergraduate, 7 graduate, and 12 research programs in active planning stages. To winnow what seemed to be academically respectable and reasonably permanent programs from a host of claims, Hall applied the following criteria: 1) Did the program have a legal or at least quasi-legal standing within its institution? 2) Did it include three or more pertinent disciplines, other than language, on something like a basis of equality? 3) Was adequate instruction provided, and a reasonable competence required in the language? 4) Was some workable medium of integration employed, such as joint seminars, cooperative courses, or group-defined objectives and group analysis of results? Three other requirements were imposed upon programs in the planning stage: that they were sponsored by "what seemed to be a respectable faculty group, containing promising leadership"; that they were favored or at least not actively opposed by the local administration; and that they had not attracted undue faculty opposition.[39] Of these criteria, only the first two dealt with institutional arrangements in a quantifiable way. "Legal status" evidently indicated that the area program had a home in some named sub-section of an educational institution, while the three-discipline-plus-language rule was clear enough. But the remainder of Hall's criteria involved judgments of quality--and quality, in academic matters, could be quite ephemeral. Since the field was already in a state of lively expansion in 1946 when Hall's survey was made, the SSRC invited Wendell C. Bennett to undertake a second survey to bring the information up to date.

Bennett's criteria for an ideal area program were considerably more stringent than Hall's. He dealt only with graduate programs (though undergraduates were also enrolled in many of the programs) and imposed a rule of five pertinent subjects plus language. He excluded North American studies altogether, as Hall had not. In addition, he called for the presence of some "specific mechanisms for integrating the area studies" and for an area research program concurrent with the course of instruction. Like Hall, he required official university recognition and support of the program, adequate library resources for teaching and research, competent instruction by the intensive spoken-language method in the principal languages of the area, and emphasis on the contemporary aspects of the area.[40] Unfortunately it is not clear whether Bennett applied all of these criteria; or if he did not, which ones he did apply. In any case he named 29 programs at 28 universities as integrated area programs, distributed as follows by area:

Far East	8
Latin America	6
Russia	5
Europe	4
Southeast Asia	2
Near East	2
South Asia	1
Africa	1

Very considerable growth had taken place since Hall's survey five years earlier, according to Bennett, for Hall had found in existence only 13 integrated area programs (Latin America 6, Far East 4, Russia 3).[41] Nevertheless, the distribution of interest in foreign areas had not changed much, for the Far East, Latin America and Russia still claimed the majority of the programs, while Africa, the Near East, South and Southeast Asia were covered by a total of six programs. Development was needed in all the disciplines, but especially those relying on written materials, such as history, literature and philosophy, for these latter areas.[42] The major problem, as Bennett saw it, was one of ways and means. "Ultimately, the federal government must furnish financial support for the type of training that its activities demand," he wrote.[43]

Meanwhile the Indic and Iranian Committee of the ACLS had begun a program of revitalization. In 1947 it asked the ACLS to widen the disciplinary representation of the membership to include a historian, an anthropologist, and a sociologist and proposed that the committee be converted into a Committee on Southern Asia jointly responsible to the ACLS and the SSRC, with a broadened geographic scope including two representatives for Southeast Asia.[44] A three-year grant was provided by the Carnegie Foundation, and in 1951 the group published a ten-year development plan for South and Southeast Asian studies which is in many ways characteristic of academic thinking concerning the development of area studies at this time. The committee recommended that the "main focus of development" should be restricted to "existing centers" at Columbia, California, Pennsylvania, Cornell and Yale, in the current shortage of personnel.[45] The Committee retained a link with the past in its second recommendation that an American Institute of South Asian

Studies be established in Delhi. A third and associated recommendation was for fellowship aid for students, and other recommendations dealt with subsidizing scholarly literature by means of a monograph purchase fund and called for the publication of a South Asia Quarterly Accessions List by the Library of Congress as an aid to scholarship. The Committee estimated that some $300,000 a year would be required for the support of the five centers for Southern Asia Studies; $100,000 a year for graduate fellowships, $50,000 a year for field support for thesis research; $12,500 a year for summer grants, $25,500 a year for an American Institute; $5,000 a year for a monograph purchase program, and $11,500 a year for support of a coordinating committee on South Asia. Foundation support was essential to meet this annual bill of some $504,500, but the Committee foresaw that it alone would be insufficient and also called for federal support. Looking ahead to the end of the ten-year development period, they concluded with the hope that the programs would by then have won enough local support as a feature of general education for the universities themselves to undertake their funding on a regular basis.[46]

Reflecting the Committee's assessment of the demand and of the likeliest source of support, the report proposed to train a minimum of 750 Southern Asia scholars and specialists at the graduate level in the next ten years, 250 for the universities and 500 for the government and the professions.[47]

> As centers of instruction, the Southern Asia centers will offer primarily courses of graduate studies adapted to the needs of both prospective governmental specialists and future Southern Asia basic research scholars. . . . In addition to providing for students within the normal university framework, these centers will be equipped to offer short-term training courses in the language and general characteristics of the area whenever so requested by the government or by business organizations.[48]

As for research,

> As focal points of continuing basic research, the centers will be particularly well equipped to undertake special research assignments on contract or retainer at the request of governmental agencies or private organizations.[49]

Thus the Committee extended a clear invitation to Government to bargain: in return for government support of university facilities for area training and research, government agencies would be free to call upon these same centers for purposes of interest to them. This invitation (and others like it) was heard and heeded; as a result of it, American universities (and some colleges) within ten years plunged into an era of entirely new activities in foreign areas through the medium of contracts with government agencies. In the event, the only major error in the prediction was an error of scale. The Committee's requests were far too modest; and the developmental sums that actually came forth were, as a member of the group has admitted, beyond his or anyone else's dreams.[50]

It is difficult to see what other alternatives were available to the Committee. As we have seen, conservatism among faculty members and the smallness of university developmental resources combined to produce both institutional and intellectual resistances to the development of foreign area studies. Faced with faculty doubts and budgetary limitations, university administrators could only proceed cautiously in the field. The developers' only other feasible alternative was to create a counter-weight of support in the foundations and government with which to go to their administrators with requests for matching funds. And this was the financial history of the next decade. For half of that period, the foremost source of funds was the Ford Foundation, reorganized in 1951 as a national philanthropy. Between 1952 and 1964 it is said to have allocated some $138 million for grants "designed to improve American competence to deal with international problems," of which about half was used to strengthen non-Western language and area studies.[51] In the same period, Rockefeller and Carnegie very much slowed the tempo of their grants; Rockefeller gave some $5 million in grants and Carnegie $4 million, the latter generally in support of curricular innovations.[52]

Federal Aid to Foreign Language and Area Studies

While Foundation aid, generous as it was, supported the programs at the major universities through the 1950s, representatives of various academic organizations concentrated their efforts in Washington. Although the story of these negotiations is not yet on record, the major part in securing federal support for modern foreign language teaching and foreign area studies appears to have been played by the officers of the Modern Language Association of America, William Parker and Kenneth Mildenberger[53] and by the ACLS, which played a major role in establishing a list of "critical languages" which determined what foreign area programs would receive federal support. What became the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was in the drafting process of the Office of Education when the news of the first Soviet satellite burst on the American public. Proponents of federal aid to scientific and many other kinds of education saw this as an unexpected opportunity to convince the public of the soundness of their case, and a bill embodying federal aid to science, mathematics and foreign language education at levels from the primary school to the college was introduced as a measure of "national defense" and "critical national interest."

Conservatives at once objected that the "national security" argument was being used to facilitate general federal aid, to and therefore federal control of education. Wrote Senator Barry Goldwater:

> This bill and the foregoing remarks of the majority remind me of an old Arabian proverb: "If the camel once gets his nose in the tent, his body will soon follow." If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid, supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by Federal authorities.[54]

The sponsors of the bill agreed that "national security" was a convenient fabrication. Representative Frank Thompson (N. J.) testified three years later that:

> I viewed the legislation as, in a sense, in the best sense of the word, a gimmick. We had to sell it to a normally hostile Congress, and I think a magnificent job was done in selling it.

The act, he added, "in large measure followed in the wake of Sputnik, without which I do not think we would have been able to pass it."[55] Thus an argument current in the academic world since the end of the Second World War as a justification for foreign area programs became the means of introducing Federal support which has both extended foreign language and area programs and, paradoxically, induced educational institutions to accept more and more of the regular budgeting of these centers on a matching funds basis.

So inevitable had become the necessity for Federal support that Title VI (part A) of the NDEA, dealing with college and university language and area centers, proved in the public hearings almost the least controversial aspect of the bill. It did not affect states' rights in elementary and secondary education; it was specific and clearly related to national needs; and the principle of the relationship of modern language and area training established in the Second World War was not questioned. There were few direct lobbies for language or area studies programs at any of the various hearings held on the bill (1958, 1959, 1961, 1964), other than officers of the MLA and its Center for Applied Linguistics, who testified in 1958 and 1959, and representatives of the ACLS, which had sponsored a survey of the foreign language position for the purposes of the Act. Almost no business or commercial associations spoke at any of the hearings for the necessity of modern foreign language facility, despite the Government's expressed concern for their interests. The single exception was the National Farmers Union, whose representative stated at the 1964 hearings that the lack of language knowledge was felt to hamper the development of overseas markets:

> It was President Kennedy who first gave impetus to the doctrine that our envoys overseas, at all levels, should speak the language of the country they are domiciled in. The Russians do this. The Japanese do this. But for some reason beyond the understanding of the 250,000 farm families we represent, America only makes a try at doing it.[56]

The only mention of opposition to the provisions of Title VI at any of the hearings came from an area studies organization calling itself the National Committee on Undergraduate Training in Oriental Studies, whose representative, Professor Stanley Spector of the Department of Chinese and Japanese, Washington University, St. Louis, ascribed to fears of budgetary inadequacy academic opposition to the introduction of "languages such as Swahili, Chinese [and] Japanese." His organization's major concern, however, was not to end Federal aid to foreign language and area programs, but to extend the Act's largesse to institutions which did not maintain elaborate graduate programs.[57]

Title VI itself authorized direct federal subvention for administrative units of particular educational institutions termed in the Act "language and area centers." Federal support was not to exceed 50% of the cost of items later specified as language and area instruction, institutional overhead, library acquisitions and processing, administration, faculty travel to foreign areas, and special lectures and conferences.[58] Also authorized in the same Title were research studies to develop more effective methods of teaching modern foreign languages and to prepare urgently needed teaching materials in many of the "critical languages," and fellowships for students of the supported languages, to provide the new centers with customers. On the advice of the ACLS, Commissioner of Education Lawrence Derthick, released a bulletin in 1959 listing Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Hindustani, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish as languages most needed for business and diplomatic relations.[59] Of these, French, German, Italian, and Spanish were excluded from support becuase adequate teaching facilities already existed, leaving the remaining six "most critical languages" to determine which world areas would receive the first Federal funds in 1959.

This list was elaborated during May and June 1959 into three categories, including the six "most critical languages," where a number of Centers must be expanded, strengthened or created, and where intensive language courses could be made available frequently at widely distributed locations; other national and official languages and important unofficial languages (such as Javanese, Hausa, Swahili, Afrikaans, Cambodian, Singhalese, and Tamil), for which at least two language and area centers should make courses available annually; and other languages for which there should be at least one center, with biennial intensive courses available and resources for more frequent offerings in case of emergency.[60] During 1960 Spanish was added to the first list as Latin American centers came under the purview of the support provisions of the Act and a group of 59 languages including most African languages not already enumerated were placed in the third category.[61]

One of the reasons for the lack of interest in Title VI was that the financial outlay involved in it was relatively modest compared to that of other provisions of the Act. While about $300 million of the estimated total $840 million allocated for the first four years under the Act was devoted to student loans, for example, only about $32 million was to be expended under Title VI in the same period, and of this, only about $6 million went for direct support to administrative units.

Even with this modest outlay, the Office of Education proceeded cautiously in implementing the program. Of the 100 applications for support under Title VI received by May, 1959, the Office selected 19 for academic year 1959-60 with a total outlay of just under $500,000. The following year, "the only year in which large-scale expansion took place,"[62] 27 new centers were added and $1,575,000 allocated. The Office of Education began academic year 1961-62 by adding one new center in Russian studies at a southern university, partly to strengthen the regional distribution of centers, with an allocation of $1,750,000; but after the Alliance for Progress was announced, Office of Education policy, in accordance with national policy, altered.[63] Spanish was added to the list of "most critical languages" and five new centers for Latin American studies, four of them in the South, were added in February 1962 through an advance allocation of $100,000 from the next year's funds.

From this time on the available Federal funds were fully committed, as it was the practice to renew contracts at the same level of support as during previous years, to enable academic administrators to plan programs with reasonable assurance of support. In the words of the Office of Education report, "The Federal funds available under the Title VI appropriation have been insufficient to meet the expanding needs of the language and area centers program since that time."[64] During 1962-63, therefore, one new center for Uralic-Altaic studies was added; and during the following academic year (1963-64) by means of funds transferred from the fellowship program, a new South Asia center, a new African center, and doubled support to another African center were authorized. By 1964 a total of 55 centers at 34 institutions of higher education were receiving support, distributed by world areas as follows:[65]

East Asia 11	Middle East 8	Sub-Saharan Africa 5
Slavic and East Europe 10	South Asia 7	Southeast Asia 3
Asian-Slavic 2	Latin America 7	Uralic-Altaic 2

In terms of proportions of the funds devoted to these regions, East Asia, which claimed close to 30% of the funds allocated during 1959-60, fell to just under 20% in 1963; Slavic and Russian studies grew from just under 20% to just over 20% of the funds allocated in the same period; and Slavic-East Asian studies now claims 3 to 4% of the resources, for a total for these areas of about 45% of total Federal monies expended on language and area programs. Near and Middle Eastern Studies remained stationary at about 13% of the total in 1963,as did South Asia, while Latin America in the same period increased its share from about 10% to about 16% of Federal resources. African Studies' claims on Federal monies increased from about 1½% to 7% in the same period; Southeast Asian studies grew only from about 3% to about 4% of the resources, and Uralic-Altaic's share has decreased, relative to others, from close to 10% to about 1½%.[66]

This assignment of funds continues, therefore, to parallel the general public assessment of the relative political importance of various world areas, and the Title VI administrators in the U. S. Office of Education themselves have stated that "the paramount weaknesses at the end of five years of NDEA still appear to be chiefly in Africa and South and Southeast Asia."[67]

There have been no official reports on the NDEA Centers since the quinquenniel report appeared, from which most of these figures are taken. Support to Title VI continued at the $8 million level through 1964-65, but was increased to $13 million for 1965-66 and continues to increase gradually until fiscal year 1968, when it will reach $18 million.[68] The large increase in 1965 permitted the Office of Education to designate 30 new centers (14 for graduate study, 16 for undergraduate study), but budgeting will permit the addition of only a few new centers per year thereafter.[69] It is significant that the majority of the new centers are at institutions of undergraduate instruction.

On balance, the results of this experience for area studies up to now have been happy ones. NDEA administrators point with pride to the assertion of Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, that Federal aid had not brought federal control in its wake, and to his comment that "rarely has a small amount of money been so well and productively invested."[70] George R. Taylor, writing in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, reports flatly that "this act has been administered with scrupulous respect for the independence and dignity of the academic profession."[71]

Title VI administrators in the Office of Education, however, claim much more than this for their stewardship. They have contended that Foundation funds available for the development of language and area programs, while they served to abate fears that area studies programs would drain financial support away from more traditional departments, actually left area programs in a "financially precarious position" because area programs funded on this basis did not develop any strong claims to regular institutional support.[72] Nevertheless, they acknowledge that the years of Foundation support in the middle 1950's did settle the intellectual arguments which plagued area studies programs at their inception, thus permitting organizational work to proceed, and produced general agreement that neither the disciplines as the building blocks of knowledge nor the departments as the building blocks of institutions would be challenged.[73]

This detente, Title VI administrators claim, increased the willingness of the universities to undertake the funding of language and area studies on a regular basis; but in this they were encouraged by the entrance of the Federal government into the field. Federal matching fund requirements, according to the authors of NDEA Language and Area Centers: The First Five Years, forced universities to undertake regular budgeting for these programs; but the universities were ready for it, as shown in an analysis made in the Office of Education of the budgets of a group of 24 centers whose expenditures as early as 1961-62 and 1962-63 showed that only 20 to 30% of the total cost was being borne from Federal funds.[74] This willingness to underwrite the centers, according to Title VI administrators, shows "the extent to which the language and area center concept had found acceptance in the academic community."[75]

It is somewhat difficult to answer the question of just what kind of unit the universities and colleges had now agreed to support. Although the authors of a 1962 review of the accomplishments of language and area centers consider them "a new and pervasive force in American higher education," they nevertheless admit that at the time the Language Development Section of the Office of Education was established to administer the National Defense Education Act of 1958, "the center concept was not then or subsequently ever formally delineated."[76] At the core of the concept they find "the idea that it was desirable to supplant the single scholar in a non-Western civilization by a group of specialists";[77] but beyond this, "the Language Development Section in no way prescribed the direction of growth which a center was to take. . . . The doctrine of 'local option'--the center's right to self-determination--prevailed from the beginning."[78]

As a result, centers were located wherever convenience dictated--in a language department, in a department or department-like unit whose work was interdisciplinary in nature, such as a Russian or Far Eastern Studies department; or as a tight or loose interdepartmental enterprise (sometimes because centers were not welcome in departments). In most cases, the centers "encourage and coordinate" teaching and research programs, rather than assume responsibility for actual teaching, so that communication, cooperation and coordination are their main functions. Visitors to the centers, according to the authors of the 1962 review, found them to be "something both more and less than an academic department."[79]

In fact, very little is known of the operation of these centers. It would seem that their ability to perform their communication and coordination activities would be greatly affected not only by the general organization of the university and by the interest and ability of center officers, but by where in the organizational structure the center is placed and its informal organization. While Axelrod and Bigelow's report is filled with insights into these problems,[80] it is far from systematic or complete in its treatment, and it has not been joined by anything more elaborate in the interval since its publication. It has the further disadvantage of treating mainly centers in large and organizationally elaborate institutions of graduate training, so that no information in the experience of NDEA centers more recently established at undergraduate institutions is now available.

This material illustrates a difficulty of conducting a discussion of educational change upon the basis of national surveys: material gathered on a national level tends to remain a recounting of individual differences resolved by the application of a few general similarities, behind which it is possible only to glimpse the actual organizations at work. It is not easy to discover from materials of this sort how change actually takes place.

Consequences of National Funding

An unexpectedly rapid percolation of foreign area studies to the undergraduate level was the result of both Foundation and national funding of these programs.[81] An enormous service literature now began to grow up about the subject of area studies as the earliest established foreign area programs became models to later comers. Every institution with a foreign area course seemed to have at least one faculty member who felt duty bound to rush a description of the course into print.[82]

One of the liveliest and longest-lived discussions has concerned the problem of how to translate the university programs in usable form to the level of the smaller liberal arts colleges; and it is in this literature that the discussion has been most narrowly focused on area studies purely as a curriculum issue.[83] Smaller colleges with limited resources have consistently claimed that they cannot invest in large numbers of specialists in the non-Western regions and have sought ways to add material on foreign areas without radically altering the existing shape of their curricular offerings. In finding ways to meet this problem they have sought advice at certain major universities which have become identified with particular approaches to the matter. Of these, the most discussed have perhaps been the historical and literary approach used at Columbia University, and the integrated interdisciplinary approach focussing on problems or distinctive features of foreign civilizations worked out at the University of Chicago.[84]

Through this discussion, foreign area studies have gained much in intellectual respectability; and they have now come to be regarded as an ordinary part of liberal education in many quarters. H. G. Creel, writing in 1959 on Chinese studies in general education, felt that "it would be excessively 'ivory tower' to hold that general education should not. . . give students a certain minimum of knowledge of the world in which they live."[85] W. T. DeBary, remarking five years later on the general recognition that foreign area studies had achieved as a part of liberal education, was not inclined to give much credit to foreign area studies specialists for this achievement:

> In 1950 one had to argue the point with proponents of so-called 'non-Western studies' that broadening of the curriculum should be considered in the context of liberal education as a whole and not simply offered as a response to the shift in the world power balance.[86]

Nevertheless, the continuing flood of exhortations to colleges and schools to add foreign area programs suggests that not everyone has been convinced; DeBary, as late as 1964, devoted an entire lecture "to show how a world outlook is rooted in and deeply relevant to the traditional concerns of liberal learning."[87]

The admission of foreign area studies to the banquet table of liberal learning has had many repercussions. Among the first to feel the effect were the classical Orientalists, who concluded in a discussion of the place of Oriental studies in a university curriculum held at the 1955 annual meeting of the American Oriental Society:

> Oriental study needs to set its own house in order if it is to gain admission to university curriculums on a greater scale. There should be an end to overspecialization; a definition of the field and of the basic competences required of an 'orientalist'; a much greater enthusiasm. . . to teach Oriental literatures in translation. . . ; and finally, support and encouragement of area studies.[88]

The assembled learned gentlemen regretfully agreed that so much emphasis had been placed by Orientalists on competence in the languages of the Orient that general subjects such as world literature were being taught by scholars without any competence in matters Oriental; they urged that the competence of Orientalists be enlarged to include a "minimum common core" of history, literature and art so that the graduate Orientalist will become "a definable quantity in the administrator's eyes," like a graduate psychologist.[89]

Next to take alarm were members of departments of Classics. A writer in the Classical Journal warned classicists in 1963 that "within the next few decades liberal arts education. . . will shift considerably from its present focus on the traditions of Western Europe to a wider view of the world and man's responsibility in it,"[90] and that the "total educational impact" of departments of classics is "likely to decrease in the long run directly in proportion to the decrease in the emphasis on Western civilization."[91] Reviewing possible strategies for dealing with this development, he rejects such tactics as accepting and then dragging heels as was done in opposing the abolition of required Latin; a sales campaign for Classics is unsuitable, because "all the other disciplines will be and are conducting sales campaigns, and their claims are all justified";[92] while the course of proclaiming the "absolute value of the classics" has the disadvantage of limiting what classicists will be asked to teach to a few "great books" and bars them from handling the interrelationships of art, history and literature.[93] The only remaining alternative, according to this writer, is to take the enemy into camp by inviting scholars of "classical China and classical India" to become members of Classics Departments and by creating a new, world classicism.[94]

What all this discussion really signifies, of course, is that foreign area studies by percolating to the undergraduate level has gained access to the mainstream of American higher education. This event has been hastened by the concurrent emergence of a new kind of literature, the national-level report on the state of what has come to be called "international education" in one or another of its selected aspects. Directly descended from such early surveys of the state of area studies as Hall and Bennett, what has now become a distinguishable class of literature in its own right has grown from an endowment given by the Carnegie Corporation to the American Council on Education in 1950 for a program intended to stimulate educational institutions (mainly undergraduate institutions) to make inventories of their resources and plan development of their activities in world affairs. It includes a long series of titles financed by the Carnegie endowment which review teaching on various foreign areas in various disciplines, the place of the foreign student in American higher education, the need of the citizen for international education, and similar topics.[95] But undoubtedly its most prestigious representative has been the report of the Committee on the University and World Affairs ("The Morrill Committee") organized in 1959 by the Ford Foundation.

The Committee, which included such representatives of Government as Arthur S. Flemming, then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Senator J. W. Fulbright, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, also included Foundation representatives (John W. Gardner of Carnegie Corporation, later Director of AID), business men (Harold Boeschenstein, president of Owens-Corning Fiberglass, Philip D. Reed, former chairman of the board, General Electric Corporation), and academics (Franklin D. Murphy, Chancellor of UCLA, Harvie Branscomb, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, and J. L. Morrill, chairman of the committee and former president of the University of Minnesota).

The burden of the Committee's report was that greatly increased, planned response on the part of American universities to "heavy new demands" for "direct service" to society would be required in the decade of the 1960s.[96] There must be "a lifting of sights that will transcend. . . the limited aims of 'technical assistance' and 'national defence'" on the part of both government and the universities.[97] There must be "higher priority for world affairs in education" on the part of the universities, and for education in international programs on the part of government. For the American institutions of higher education which were to assume these new functions in "direct international service," there must be "improved organization and cooperation."

What some of these "heavy new demands" for "direct service" on the part of American universities would be was spelled out in no uncertain terms by the Report. World affairs should become an important and permanent dimension of undergraduate education everywhere; "many universities (more than at present) should become diversified centers of strength to train specialists in world affairs." Special programs should be developed for foreign students; American universities should undertake institution-to-institution cooperation with universities in foreign countries and should furthermore undertake immediate planning for such an eventuality. They warned that "what may often be needed is a long-range, university-wide approach, under the highest auspices, to the total complex of substantive activities and administrative arrangements in the international field."[98]

The entrance of the universities into direct foreign assistance, the Committee foresaw, would require federal, state, foundation, and private enterprise funding. They saw the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as "a modest precedent for the kind of support that is needed,"[99] but dubbed it "a patchwork of particularism" which "does not represent a policy so much as a series of separate reactions to current emergencies."[100] They called for expansion of the act "to provide further support for the world affairs activities of universities," giving their blessing to the matching funds principle with some reservations.[101]

A final recommendation concerned the need for "improved educational leadership and machinery for cooperation" both within Government and among the various American educational institutions involved in world affairs. For this purpose, the Report called for the creation of a new private organization to act as an informational clearing house and to facilitate cooperation of the desired kind. This recommendation took form as Education and World Affairs, Inc. (EWA), a nonprofit organization whose researches into the questions and problems raised by the Morrill Committee report have enriched this stream of literature.

Ford responded to the Committee's recommendations by informing certain universities in the same year that it was willing to consider making long-term, university-level grants for various phases of international education if the universities would undertake the responsibility for scrutiny and review of the projects funded under such grants. This announcement had the effect of sending those universities which did not already possess them into a mad scramble to organize offices of international studies and international programs (usually termed institutes) reporting either to the President or to some officer close to him, in order to indicate to the Foundation their preparedness and ability to administer new programs. Since 1962 a series of publications has rated universities on their organization for international service. These ratings usually consist of a description of what the university is doing in the field of teaching about foreign areas, in foreign language teaching, in receiving and integrating foreign students, in research on foreign areas, and in development assistance to these areas, followed by an analysis of the organization of the administrative units which deal with these activities and of the means of "integration" they employ to communicate their activities to other units of the university.[102] It is significant that Michigan State University, whose development assistance activities in Viet Nam have recently come under severe criticism, does well in such ratings.[103]

Government relations with the universities have come in for the same sort of scrutiny, usually accompanied by severe criticism of both sides, in the same period.[104] In all of these publications, the view of foreign area studies that is taken comes very much closer than ever before to realizing an early post-Second World War fear that foreign area studies would be seen as an arm of American foreign policy.[105] Thus both Gardner's report on AID and the Morrill Report, for example, stress that government agencies using the universities and their personnel as a resource must pay, and pay generously in overhead, to strengthen the universities for foreign service by helping them to enlarge their foreign area training facilities.[106] Through the care and circumspection of Federal agencies and the purposeful involvement of academics at every level of responsibility for these international activities, what could certainly be an unpleasant and demaging political controversy has not arisen. What is quite clear is that area studies programs in many universities have been transplanted to and embedded in a new milieu, both of organization and of overseas activities. Whatever the direction in which foreign area programs travel in the future, it is quite clear that things will never be quite the same again. High level involvement of the universities, the Foundations, and the Government have already caused profound changes in the universities' relationship to foreign areas. It is safe to say that these changes will continue.

The Role of the Colleges in the New Dispensation

While the colleges are for the most part (but not entirely) excluded from the exciting new international activities to which the universities have been invited, they have not been ignored in the series of national reports on international education.[107] Thus the Association of American Colleges' 1964 survey of non-Western studies in the liberal arts college begins with the assertion that "the question whether systematic study of the 'non-Western' world should be incorporated into liberal education is one that no college can hope to avoid."[108] Of the Association's 848 members, 163 were excluded from the survey because they were not liberal arts colleges; 152 failed to reply and 51 stated that in no courses was any part of the "non-Western" world considered. Four hundred eighty-two colleges stated that they maintained some kind of activity (including extracurricular activity) concerning the non-Western areas, and 440 offered courses, including, those with less than 50% "non-Western" content. But the distribution of courses by world area shows that the majority of attention is devoted to Russia and Eastern Europe, East Asia (or Asia in general), and Latin America. When "infusion" courses with less than 50% "non-Western" content were added to courses whose main focus was on a non-Western area, Russia and Eastern Europe led with 875 courses, East Asia (or Asia in general) followed with 656 courses, and Latin America ran a close third with 625 courses. All other world areas ran far behind, with 149 courses on Africa and 52 on Southern Asia; and when infusion courses were excluded, less than a seventh of courses were devoted to areas outside Russia, East Asia (or Asia in general) and Latin America.

Despite the larger number of courses devoted to Russia, the Commission apparently felt that the quality of work on East Asia was superior, for it remarked that "Of all the cultural areas covered by substantial work at the undergraduate level, East Asia, with special reference to China, and the Chinese language, is pre-eminent. . . . For no other cultural area are course offerings in general as complete and meaningful as for the Far East."[109]

The report also noted a feature of area studies programs in the colleges which is evidently more characteristic of the colleges than of the universities--inter-institutional cooperation. Some 102 of the 482 colleges reporting any non-Western activity maintained some form of interinstitutional cooperation, excluding arrangements for sending faculty or students individually to avail themselves of offerings elsewhere. A variety of cooperative arrangements included everything from student option to work at other institutions to joint sponsorship of lectures and art exhibits, joint library purchases and use of library facilities, joint faculty seminars and sharing of faculty with other institutions.[110]

While the Association of American Colleges was investigating the spread of foreign area studies in the colleges, Education and World Affairs was distributing a report on the college situation modelled on its earlier The University and World Affairs. "An Autonomous committee, brought together and financed by a grant from the Edward W. Hazen Foundation," the group consisted of the presidents of Haverford, Dartmouth, Elmira, Mills and Carleton Colleges, the president of Duke University, the provost of Dartmouth, a professor of history at Indiana University, and representatives of Education and World Affairs and the Ford Foundation. The report, known as the Nason Report, called upon colleges to carry out a "revolution in education" "required by the conditions of the modern world" and "essential to survival and implicit in the nature of liberal learning."[111] This revolution was to be accomplished by the introduction of such new approaches as comparative analysis in old courses and by adding new courses concerned specifically with non-Western areas.[112] The colleges were urged to take the approaches of such universities as Michigan, Columbia and Chicago as models in curriculum reform.

This report has not, until now, been followed by an announced new policy on the part of a Foundation or public agency which would provide a financial incentive to colleges to carry out its recommendations, although some incentive of this kind is given by the U. S. Office of Education's decision to award more and more NDEA language and area center contracts to undergraduate institutions, and Foundations have tended to look favorably on requests from colleges for funds for cooperative programs.[113] So far, the most direct tangible result has been the organization of a standing committee on Intercultural Education by Education and World Affairs. The more generalized propaganda of the last ten years and the availability to colleges of more and more graduate products of university foreign area programs appear to have accomplished the same aim, however, for the columns of such publications as the Newsletter of the Association for Asian Studies are filled with announcements of new programs on foreign areas at more and more educational institutions. Foreign area studies, in short, bid fair to become a fashion in higher education. While the report specifically did not suggest that colleges should attempt to emulate the universities' participation in foreign assistance programs, some have not hesitated to do so.[114] Unless colleges form consortia to carry out these activities, however, their activities in this field will be considerably more than the universities.

In the universities, the tendency seems to be to view the colleges with the high schools as appropriate recipients of experience and knowledge diffused from university centers. Just as universities are now expected to undertake direct educational development in foreign areas, there is coming to be a new expectation that university centers of foreign area studies should undertake educational development in the high schools and colleges. Thus the December 1965 Princeton Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in American High Schools and Colleges, sponsored by the Office of Education with NDEA funds, recommended that "all institutions should be encouraged to develop representative offerings in at least one area-language combination," but since this goal was at some distance, "in the interim it would be advantageous to create a nationwide network of cooperative programs, each serving several colleges."[115] The experience of those university language and area centers which have attempted this type of service program, according to the recommendations of the conference, "suggests that one of the most effective interim ways of extending language and area instruction to the secondary schools is for such university centers to service several schools in the surrounding areas on a cocurricular or extracurricular basis."[116] Thus more service to the educational community at large may be expected of university area studies programs in the future.[117]

Foreign Area Studies and the Disciplines

Despite all that has been said about the organizational detente which developed between area studies and the departments, there still remains a real question as to the impact of the study of foreign areas upon the disciplines. As a first approximation to answering this question, it may be said that it depends partly upon the discipline and more upon the foreign area. Thus, Latin American studies seem to have had little impact on the contributory disciplines in terms either of new methodology or new theoretical insights arising from the study of these areas.[118] Africa, on the other hand, is admitted on all sides to have wrought profound changes in disciplines which have traditionally relied largely on written materials for evidence, such as history and political science, and to have contributed very greatly to the emergence of new areas of inquiry intermediate to several of the social sciences, such as sociolinguistics.[119] Somewhere midway between Latin America and Africa in their impact on the disciplines stand the major areas of Asia.[120]

While there is manifest a certain tendency on the part of area specialists each to claim for "his" region the honor of introducing new theoretical perspectives in one or more disciplines, area specialists can properly assert with Felix M. Keesing, in his 1954 presidential address to the Association for Asian Studies, that area studies, focussing both disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches upon a region, have been "a strong contributing factor to a rapprochement between the humanities and the social sciences."[121] This rapprochement has been affected by the cultural and social peculiarities of particular world areas, which have forced scholars whose disciplines have been developed upon types of evidence peculiar to "Western" culture to turn to the techniques of other disciplines when confronted with unfamiliar world areas and gaps in the kinds of data they are accustomed to use.

This development has not been without its discomforts. Complained Keesing,

> It is difficult enough to keep up with the internal elaboration of our own discipline. . . . For an individual to master the discourse of two disciplines makes him a rarity, perhaps even a suspicious character; and for an interdisciplinary group to learn to respond to common symbols, without one or another going under ignominiously, calls for prolonged and painful effort.[122]
>
> We need more talking, and if possible writing, on what each of our disciplines may contribute to the other /in the study of foreign areas/, and that somehow in forms that will not debase the currencies involved. . . . The problems of intercommunication at this explicit level are very real.[123]

Perhaps the difficulties of a mutual intellectual reorientation are responsible for the rapid demise of most of the large interdisciplinary group research projects on foreign areas which seemed so promising a means of forwarding foreign area study in the early postwar period. Nevertheless, the very characteristics of the foreign areas being studied forced the researchers involved to continue the quest for new approaches; and what could not be accomplished by face-to-face confrontation has been carried out, instead, by private research and written communication through the journals.

Foreign Area Studies and Organizational Activities

The need for communication among scholars of different disciplines interested in particular world areas has been mirrored in both organizational activity and the appearance of journals devoted to particular world areas in the last twenty years. Of the academic organizations devoted to foreign areas, perhaps the oldest and largest is the Far Eastern Association, founded in 1942, reorganized as a scholarly association in 1947, and enlarged to become the Association for Asian Studies in 1955. Its journal, the old _Far Eastern Quarterly_, now renamed the _Journal of Asian Studies_, represents well scholarly publications of such organizations. It carries articles on all parts of Asia from Pakistan to Korea, with the heaviest contributions in the fields of literature, history, politics and economics; a large section of each issue is devoted to reviews of scholarly literature and one extra issue each year contains a bibliography, yearly becoming noticeably fatter, of scholarly works concerning these world areas published in the United States, Britain, and the countries themselves.

The Association's membership now stands at something over 3000 and its organization is rather elaborate, reflecting its wide range of activities.

Besides a Secretariat, the Association maintains seventeen committees in two categories, one administrative and the other project-oriented. The administrative committees perform the usual tasks of setting up the annual program, sponsoring monographs, and the journal and maintaining ties with other organizations such as the ACLS and UNESCO. The project committees are designed more to serve specific professional needs of segments of the membership interested in South or East Asia than to further the cause of Asian studies in general. These committees are supported by special Foundation grants, such as those provided by the Rockefeller Foundation for the Committee on Chinese Thought and the South Asia Committee. Among the tasks of the project committees are scholarly publications and the development of graduate training programs. From both the funding of the project committees and their scope of activity, it can be seen that there is an organizational tendency within the Association toward specialization rather than interdisciplinary undertakings.

Statistics of annual meetings of the Association for Asian Studies suggest current trends in this curriculum field. Its 1966 annual meeting, the largest to date, drew over 1500 observers. While this number is far smaller than that drawn by the giant disciplinary associations such as the American Historical Association or the American Sociological Association, it suggests that the organization is well beyond the stage of face-to-face interaction and large personal familiarity of individuals with the membership. It also appears that the study of areas represented by this association is spreading among American colleges and universities, for while in 1958, 131 scholars from 42 domestic institutions presented papers, in 1966 some 187 scholars from 61 domestic institutions appeared on the program. A few scholars from foreign universities (6 in 1958, 10 in 1966) also appeared; and the use of the meeting as a forum for personnel of various non-academic organizations seemed to be less frequent in 1966 than in 1958 (19 speakers form 12 organizations, most of them ancillary scholarly organizations such as the Asia Society or the Human Relations Area Files in 1958; 13 speakers from 11 organizations such as the U. S. State Department, U.S.I.A., or the Washington Post in 1966).

Analysis of the programs of the 1958 and 1966 annual meetings suggests that increase in the number of area specialists in this period has produced some loss of communication between scholars specializing in different parts of the Asian area. Thus the number of panels devoted to recognized subregions of the area grew dramatically in this period, while the number of panels on comparative topics declined. China specialists had a choice of seven panels in 1958, eight in 1966; but Japan specialists, who might have heard two panels in 1958, could choose from eight in 1966. India and Southeast Asia showed similar development, increasing from two panels each in 1958 to seven and six, respectively, in 1966. Of 19 panels on comparative topics held in 1958, four were comparative studies within subregions, such as Southeast Asia; but of 11 panels on comparative topics held in 1966, two concerned East Asia, two compared India and Pakistan, and two compared parts of Southeast Asia. The lesson of the statistics is quite clear: more area specialists produce more specialization, and the Association for Asian Studies appears to be approaching a position in which it will represent a congeries of quasi-disciplines focussed on the subregions of Asia, with very little in common except the disciplines!

This growth of specialization within the organization, and the increasing complexity of the organization itself, has not gone unnoticed. John K.

Fairbank, in his 1959 presidential address to the Association, advanced the belief that "one measure of our inadequacies in scholarship is our excessive degree of organizational activity." He complained that the "low scholarly standard" of much work in the Asian field is "compounded by. . . the increasing proliferation of memoranda, projects, conferences and communications," producing "a burden of written matter which pre-empts much of our time for scholarly effort."[124]

The African Studies Association, on the other hand, presents a rather different picture. Founded in 1957, it remains a relatively small group. Though the membership reached 1,337 in October 1964, only 464 of these were voting members; the majority were associates in various universities and other employment who do not maintain a close interest in the association, students and institutional memberships.[125] This association, according to one writer, has been "remarkable for its deliberate lack of structure," maintaining only a part-time Executive Secretary and a secretary and "studiously avoiding" the publication of a journal. Annual meetings are built about plenary sessions, regional meetings, or subject-oriented sessions, where the discussion tends to be interdisciplinary, and an air of rather cozy sociability seems to prevail.[126] In part this is the result of the slight predominance which anthropology seems to maintain in African studies.[127] In part also the ease of communication seems to be a result of the "anthropologizing" of members of other disciplines interested in Africa; but there are signs that it will soon give way before a series of groups interested in particular sub-regions of Africa as the number of specialists grows.[128] But beyond this, the African Studies Association has had to face up to the implications of some of the developments involving the universities directly in technical assistance previously outlined in this paper in a way that the corresponding Asian studies group has not. Thus, for example, the role of American universities in technical assistance has been a subject of discussion in the Association for some years.

A long review of assistance programs in Africa made in 1960 by Frederic Wickert concluded that not only was there little interest on the part of African studies specialists in technical assistance programs carried out in Africa by particular universities and colleges, but sometimes African studies programs were organized as a reflex of technical assistance programs.[129] Since then, however, technical assistance and African studies programs have grown very much closer; as can be seen in the listings of the curricular and research programs of African Studies centers in the April 1966 African Studies Bulletin which also contained a section on "African connections." Out of 21 major centers of African studies (applying the Bennett criteria to information supplied by the universities), 12 maintained African connections of various kinds, including sister school relationships with African universities (5), special faculty ties providing for administrative advice and assistance to African universities (2), faculty exchanges (2), research projects conducted jointly with an African university (1), and research projects conducted jointly with an African government (1). In three further cases, associations with African universities, probably of the sister school type, could not be classified. In contrast, only one of the seventeen institutions listed in ASB as maintaing less elaborate African studies programs also engaged in an African connection, and that program (at Roosevelt University) was not classified as a major center only for lack of information on its program.[130]

Discussion of these matters is remarkable largely for its absence in the pages of publications of the Association for Asian Studies,[131] suggesting that perhaps these issues have not come to the forefront of scholarly consciousness in the Asian region because the prevailing political climate in some parts of that region is unfavorable to the involvement of academics in such joint educational-governmental ventures. Nevertheless, numerous U. S. government-sponsored programs to aid Indian education are already in process and we can expect to see more such activities both in South Asia and in parts of Southeast Asia such as Malaysia. It remains to be seen what effect the new context of area studies will have upon academic research and organization concerned with the Asian region.

Unresolved Problems

The single most obvious impression created by a review of the development of foreign area studies programs is, then, one of ambiguity. Since, as Joseph Greenberg has observed, "area study programs failed to shake the fundamental organizational basis of American academic life," most foreign area programs today are interdepartmental as well as interdisciplinary and their staff members are usually at the same time members of disciplinary departments. For those who feel that the administrative organization of educational institutions ought to reflect, even if only approximately, the "requirements of the quest for knowledge itself," this lack of organizational autonomy represents an unresolved problem.[132] And there are many reflections of the organizationally ambiguous state of foreign area studies.

One aspect of the ambiguous status of these programs is seen in the wide variety of duties they are called on to perform. Richard M. Morse, in a thoughtful talk to the 1965 Princeton Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in Colleges and High Schools, speculated on the forces which seem to render universities "almost defenceless" before requests from such groups as the Morrill Committee that they perform such "probably incompatible tasks" as furthering American policy goals, giving Americans better understanding of other peoples, helping other nations 'emerge', and helping other nations emerge along non-totalitarian lines.[133] He urged universities to agree that the first of their priorities in this welter of conflicting demands was for educational reform, which the impact of foreign area studies had shown to be vitally necessary. His list of proper priorities for universities to take with them into government negotiations includes, in the following order, the pedagogical priority: to educate Americans to participate in their own culture; the tactical priority: to make non-western studies programs serve as "beachheads for broad academic reform"; the representational priority: to provide "mature, permanent constituencies for foreign cultures and societies (not political regimes) within our country"; and liaison with foreign educational institutions.[134] Yet this same conference in its general report urged college and university language and area studies centers to take on the further job of creating networks of inservice training in foreign area studies for both teachers and students of small colleges and high schools in their immediate hinterlands.

As Morse correctly implies, the apparent helplessness of universities before the diverse demands made of them relate directly to the fact that "extra-university agencies are carpentering the horse."[135] The authors of The Federal Interest in Higher Education note three sources of the difficulties afflicting university-government relations in the dispersion of programs affecting higher education among numerous Federal agencies which in turn reinforces the traditional dispersion of decision making in the universities; and the matching-grant principle.[136] Of the relationship of the matching-grant principle to the problem of priorities, they observe:

> The matching-grant principle has always had a potentially distorting effect by encouraging expenditures--in this case by colleges and universities--for purposes that might not be of the highest priority, were other things equal. . . . It should not be overlooked that in a sense this is precisely the purpose of such grant-in-aid programs. . . . The matching-grant is, always has been, and no doubt always will be a persuasive argument; but it nonetheless frequently seems like arm-twisting to the institution.[137]

This suggests that as long as outside aid must be depended upon as a considerable, if not major, source of financing for foreign area studies, the status of these programs in the institutions will remain somewhat ambiguous.

Parallelling the ambiguous status of centers of language and area study is the ambiguous status of foreign area scholars themselves. Complained John K. Fairbank to the Association for Asian Studies in 1959:

> What has been our effect on American education? Outside the colleges and university graduate schools where we Asian scholars are active, we must admit that our influence on American public secondary education has been very small indeed.
>
> What has been our effect on foreign policy? When attacked for having influenced policy, Asia specialists usually deny it with vigor and justice. Here we can see a dilemma--if we Asian specialists have indeed influenced American policy, why is it so inadequate? If we have no influence, on the other hand, what use are we?[138]

Fairbank's prescription for dealing with these questions is that "we who specialize in Asian Studies should not be expected to deal either with American public education or with American foreign policy. Our task is to concentrate on scholarship";[139] but this same scholar has recently testified before a prestigious Senate committee on some of the most hotly debated issues of current American foreign policy in Southeast Asia.

If the status of foreign area scholars is doubtful in the eyes of the general educational world and the public, it is apparently dubious as well (at least in some fields) to those who work in a single foreign area. Robert I. Crane, writing on the inadequacies of South Asian studies in the United

States, has singled out for criticism the absence of minimum professional standards for South Asia specialization in such matters as knowledge of the languages of the area. "Though at first glance this may appear to be a singularly forbidding field for cooperation, the interests of South Asian studies seem to require it," he warned.

> The fact is that serious damage can be done to the field and to its future as a legitimate and appropriate branch of academic work if criteria for sound evaluation of training are not arrived at. . . . The field can ill afford anarchy in these respects if it is to prosper.[140]

Crane's answer to a list of criticisms of South Asian studies which includes "an anarchic scramble for foundation and government support," "needless anarchy" in research, and a failure to agree on what constitutes proficiency in training on this area, is more cooperation, and the more active use of what South Asian organizations already exist, such as the relevant sub-committees of the Association for Asian Studies. But whether these groups can successfully make policy for the field depends upon prior agreement of the scholars already in the field.

The absence of standards for the judgment of professional competence is reflected in the actual curricula of the area studies programs; language study is plagued with differences of opinion as to what constitutes "intensive" study under the terms of the National Defense Education Act,[141] while area studies cannot agree on what constitutes interdisciplinary coursework. Thus the editor of an Association of American Colleges volume of papers discussing approaches to teaching on Asia at Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, and Berkeley hopes that "if the publication of these papers. . . aids educators in providing an interdisciplinary and therefore an improved view of Asian civilizations, the efforts of this editor will have been repaid."[142]

But two of the five papers deal explicitly with the teaching of Asia through one discipline, history, and both are at least implicitly anti-interdisciplinary in their orientation.

Finally, the ambiguous position of foreign area programs is reflected in students' response to them. Thus Ward Morehouse, a man who has devoted more than ten years to the promotion of foreign area studies in colleges and universities across the nation, feels that generating a "critical mass" of student involvement is crucial to the success of foreign area programs; and he charges that while the recent interest in foreign area studies appears impressive if given in percentages, it seems minor "to the point of insignificance" when it is compared with the total magnitude of the American academic effort in all the fields of the social sciences and humanities.[143] The problem, as he sees it, is one of moving foreign area studies into "the mainstream of the academic experience of the American undergraduate";[144] and he has stated that "all other things being equal," he is opposed to the establishment of area study programs for the purpose of adding this new dimension to liberal education.[145] While Morehouse admits that part of his opposition to area studies programs is tactical--in that such programs arouse fears of "empire building" elsewhere in a collegiate institution--his main complaint is that the establishment of area studies programs puts the study of foreign areas "somewhere on the periphery" of the main stream of academic life of the college community, in an obscure corner of the curriculum.[146]

Curiously enough, it is almost exclusively on qualitative judgments like those of Morehouse that one must rely when one attempts to discover what has actually occurred at particular campuses in the field of foreign area studies.[147] There seems almost a conspiracy of silence in regard to the effect of the programs themselves on the rest of the institution, the effect of outside funds on particular institutions, and similar questions. Complain Babbidge and Rosenzweig,

> What effect has the growing Federal activity in the field of higher education had on the organization of institutions of higher education themselves and on the distribution of power within them?
>
> Actually, very little is known of a systematic nature of the answer to this question. Sadly, academic people - social scientists in particular - have been slow to turn the high-powered tools of their research on the affairs of higher education.[148]

Thus a description by a Chicago faculty member of the decisions made at the University of Chicago which culminated in Chicago's distinctive interdisciplinary courses on India, Islam, China and Japan runs *in toto* as follows:

> The active interests of the faculty and a pattern of interdisciplinary committees are chiefly responsible for the integration of discipline and area in a distinctive institutional adaptation to which [Robert] Redfield and others contributed.
>
> Space does not permit a detailed description of this remarkable development.[149]

This reticence to discuss and analyze the problems of decision-making and organizational structure in foreign area studies extends to government officers as well. Writes Kenneth Mildenberger, Director of the Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education,

> The government has entered into a substantial partnership with the universities in the development of non-Western studies. Any partnership is a continually evolving relationship, and its success depends upon sincere efforts at mutual accommodation. It is not possible here to enter into the involved subject of likely or desirable alterations and enlargements of this relationship.[150]

Despite the ambiguous status of almost everything connected with the study of foreign areas, and despite a gap in the literature on the effect of these programs on particular institutional structures, it is possible to trace a series of stages in the evolution of foreign area studies programs as an element of current higher education. We find foreign area studies prior to 1940 developing mainly as a labor of love on an entirely voluntary basis by a few interested individuals, with very small scale encouragement (in financial terms not expending beyond the support of an occasional summer program) from a clearing house organization, the American Council of Learned Societies. After an exceptional period of strong government involvement and active curricular experimentation during World War II, we come to a period of uncertainty and controversy after the war.

Since 1951 we can trace three stages of progressive involvement of both outside organizations and particular educational institutions in the support of foreign area studies. In the first stage, we find Foundation grants made to individual professors or to groups of professors, who then turned to their institutions with requests for minimal support in the form of housing for foundation-supported research facilities. Very little was required of universities and colleges in this period beyond the role of landlord. Moreover, there was no assurance of continuity in such programs, and the negotiations for support and statement of the goals of the programs were done directly by the interested faculty members and Foundation representatives.

Since 1959 those institutions which have been awarded language and area centers under Federal legislation have found themselves supporting programs whose goals are outlined by this legislation, thus involving these institutions in a national program of development. These institutions are required by law to assume at least half the financial responsibility for such centers, but the details of organization have been left strictly to the individual institutions, in a kind of organizational anarchy.

Since 1961, however, with the reorientation of Ford policy toward the awarding of long-term institution-wide grants, at least some institutions have found themselves charged with full responsibility for their activities concerning foreign areas. While Ford exacted from the concerned institutions a certain kind and degree of organizational structure for the administration of such grants, the universities themselves were to assume the functions of scrutiny and review of proposed projects along with control of the purse-strings. The question of who was to get what money for what foreign area project, and under what rules it was to be spent, became a strictly intramural matter in such institutions.

These three temporal stages of development in foreign area studies, however, are not mutually exclusive. Not all institutions at any given time have ever been (nor are they likely to be in the future) in a single "stage" of development. Nevertheless, the temporal stages suggest a typology of environmental stimuli for the emergence of foreign area programs which we can employ in selecting a number of institutions as case studies for investigating the differential adaptations made by different kinds of educational institutions to similar stimuli. It should be possible to trace decision-making concerning the establishment of foreign area studies programs at various levels in particular educational administrations in this context in order to arrive at an analysis of the effect of area studies exposure upon particular disciplines and departments in the institutions' studies. With a broadly chosen spectrum of institutions, it should be possible to make some general conclusions from the case studies upon the impact of foreign area studies in American higher education.

For these reasons, the case studies will include three universities (a large state university and two private universities with markedly different approaches to foreign area teaching) and three smaller institutions. One of these will be a small-college cooperative program where cooperation has become moderately complex, including more than one cooperative activity and a formal administrative entity of some kind; a state-supported college and a private institution which have elected to develop the study of foreign areas without notable cooperation with other institutions will also be included. In order to demonstrate more clearly the impact of these studies on the organization of knowledge, the foreign areas considered will deliberately be restricted to those major areas whose cultures are markedly different from those of America and Northern Europe: East Asia, South Asia, and Africa.

Footnotes

1. Charles A. Ferguson, "Language Study and the Middle East," in Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters, *The Non-Western World in Higher Education* [*The Annals*, v. 356, 1964], 80-81. H. A. R. Gibb, *Area Studies Reconsidered* (London, 1963), 9-11.

2. *Promotion of Chinese Studies, ACLS Bulletin #10* (Washington, D. C. April 1929), 4.

3. As Kenneth S. LaTourette has observed of the A.O.S., "In general it is the non-utilitarian purpose [of studying the Orient for its own sake] which has governed and continues to govern. . . the A.O.S. . . . Historically that organization has a profound suspicion of any do-goodism. It distrusts it as non-scholarly." ("Far Eastern Studies in the U. S. Retrospect and Prospect," *Far Eastern Quarterly* XV (1955), 9.)

4. Reported in *ibid*.

5. Charles S. Gardner, *Chinese Studies in America: A Survey of Resources and Facilities - I: Eastern Canada and New England* (Washington, D. C., 1935), 3.

6. Edward C. Carter, *China and Japan in Our University Curricula* (New York, 1929), 22-35.

7. Kenneth S. LaTourette, "The Far East in American Education," *School and Society*, 31 (1930), 69-74. Maurice T. Price, "The Next Step in Oriental Studies in our American Universities and Colleges," *The Historical Outlook*,
8. XXIII (1932), 113-117; "Making Foreign Area Curriculums Feasible," *The Educational Record*, 28 (1947), 429-43; "A Proposal for Foreign Area Courses," *AAUPB*, 31 (1945), 648-57.

8. Eldon Griffin, *Progress of Chinese Studies in the United States of America, ACLS Bulletin #11* (Washington, D. C. May 1931).

9. Mortimer Graves, "Seminar in Far Eastern Studies," *Pacific Affairs*, 5 (1932), 1072-78.

10. Mortimer Graves, "Two Experiments in Education," *American Scholar*, 3 (1934), 359-60.

11. Committee of the American Historical Association on the Planning of Research, *Historical Scholarship in America: Needs and Opportunities* (New York, 1932), 34.

12. See for example the *Directory of Organizations in America Concerned with China* (Washington, D. C.), compiled for ACLS by Wilma Fairbank in 1942. She includes, using multiple listings by functions for 107 organizations:
    24 missionary or religious
    2 YMCA and YWCA
    11 institutions with "active China associations"; 1 a club, 10 either financed or operated some organization in China

12. (cont.)
    10 purveyors of books and technical equipment
    8 "clearing houses"
    12 "news services"
    17 medical agencies
    10 agencies of "public opinion"
    26 relief organizations
    6 "social and cultural" groups or exchanges
    17 student aid groups
    3 research support
    3 trade promotion
    3 transportation

13. Documented in Kenneth S. LaTourette, "Far Eastern Studies in the U. S. Retrospect and Prospect," *Far Eastern Quarterly* XV (1955), 3-11.

14. W. Norman Brown, "India and Humanistic Studies in America," *Indic Studies in America, ACLS Bulletin,* #28 (Washington, D. C., 1939), 22.

15. *Ibid*., 24.

16. Gardner, *Op*. cit., 3-5.

17. *Indic Studies in America*. *ACLS Bulletin #28* (Washington, D. C., May 1939), 27-107.

18. George Beckmann, "The Role of the Foundations," *The Non-Western World in Higher Education*, in *The Annals*, v. 356 (Philadelphia, 1965), 14.

19. The amount of Rockefeller aid involved in these programs between 1942 and 1945 is said to be more than the total Rockefeller grants to area studies in the previous ten years. *Ibid*., 14.

20. For the history and assessment of these programs see Charles S. Hyneman, "The Wartime Area and Language Courses," *AAUPB #31* (1945), 434-47; William N. Fenton, *Reports on Area Studies in American Universities* (Washington, 1945), and *Area Studies in American Universities* (Washington, 1947), and his "Integration of Geography and Anthropology in Army Area Study Curricula," *AAUPB #32* (1946), 696-706.

21. R. A. Hall, Jr., "Progress and Reaction in Modern Language Teaching," *AAUPB #31* (1945), 220-30. M. A. Pei, "A Modern Language Teacher Replies," *AAUPB #31* (1945), 409-17. J. S. Diekhoff, "The Mission and Method of Army Language Teaching," *AAUPB #31* (1945), 606-20.

22. Diekhoff, *ibid*., 619-20.

23. Milton Singer, "The Social Sciences in Non Western Studies" in *The Annals* v. 356 (Philadelphia, 1964), 32.

24. These complaints catalogues in Robert Hall, *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (New York, 1947). One of the few balanced assessments of area studies to appear in this period is Meribeth E. Cameron, "Far Eastern Studies in

24. (cont.)
the United States," *Far Eastern Quarterly* 7 (1948), 115-35.

25. The Social Science Research Council Sponsored one half-hearted attempt to make area studies respectable during this period in Julian H. Steward's, "Area Research: Theory and Practice," *SSRC Bulletin #63* (New York, 1950).

26. Fenton, *Area Studies in American Universities*, 81.

27. *Ibid.*, 81-2.

28. Werner J. Cahnman, "Outline of a Theory of Area Studies," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 38 (1948), 233-43.

29. Hall, *op.cit.*, 22-28.

30. E. J. McGrath, "Area Studies," *JHE* 22 (1951), 240.

31. Cahnman, *op.cit.*, 234. A much more extreme statement of this point of view is found in Jerome S. Rauch, "Area Institute Programs and African Studies," *J. Negro Ed.* 24 (1955), 409-25. A persistent special claim has been made for African studies by proponents of American Negro colleges. Negro colleges are urged to go into the foreign area studies field through African studies which are seen as a curriculum field especially appropriate to such schools. But the motives here are far from purely scientific; Rauch asserts that Negroes educated about Africa could offset the "distorting" effect of the identification of foreign policy aims with foreign area studies by "identifying" with African nationalism; others urge Negro colleges to take up African studies so that Negroes may represent the U. S. as diplomats, teachers, and technical assistance officers in Africa. See eedell W. Neyland, "Africa: New Frontiers for Teaching in Negro Institutions of Higher Learning," *The Educational Record* 42 (1961), 57-61.

32. Charles Wagley, *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas* (New York, 1948), 9.

33. G. P. Murdock, "The Conceptual Basis of Area Research," *World Politics* II (1950), 571.

34. Usually phrased as "area studies lacks a 'hard core'."

35. Wendell C. Bennett, *Area Studies in American Universities* (New York, 1951), v.

36. *Ibid.*, 4-5.

37. *Ibid.*

38. *Ibid.*, 6-7

39. Hall, *op.cit.*, 9.

40. Bennett, op.cit., 46.

41. How Bennett arrived at these figures is far from clear. Hall showed four universities which had graduate and undergraduate training programs in operation and group research planned but not yet in operation for the Far East; three universities which had undergraduate and graduate training programs in operation in Russian studies, only one of which planned research in the area; and four universities which had graduate and undergraduate training programs on Latin America in operation. One of these also had a Latin America research project in operation. (Hall, op.cit., 88-90.)

42. Bennett, op.cit., 34-35.

43. Ibid., 41.

44. Members of the committee include W. Norman Brown and Holden Furber, Ainslie Embree, Yale; David Mandelbaum, California; Lauriston Sharp, Cornell; Kingsley Davis, Columbia; Franklin Edgerton and Horace Poleman of the Library of Congress, Mortimer Graves of ACLS, and Bryce Wood, SSRC.

45. Complete silence is maintained about the internal arrangements of these centers and their relationship with their universities.

46. Joint Committee on Southern Asia of the ACLS and the SSRC, Southern Asia Studies in the United States: A Survey and a Plan (Philadelphia, 1951), 5,12-15.

47. Ibid., 13.

48. Ibid., 39-40.

49. Ibid., 40.

50. W. Norman Brown, "Development of South Asia Studies in the United States, 1951-61," in Richard Lambert, Resources for South Asian Area Studies in the U. S. (Philadelphia, 1961), 12.

51. Grants prior to 1960 did not in most cases exceed $500,000. After 1960 a number of large, long-term grants were made to major universities.

52. Beckmann, op.cit., 15.

53. Both of whom were immediately coopted into the Office of Education to set up the programs enabled by the NDEA of 1958. Title VI, it has been charged, was "written in the offices of MLA." See Donald N. Bigelow and Joseph Axelrod, Resources for Language and Area Studies: A Report on an Inventory of the Language and Area Centers Supported by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Washington, 1962), 11.

54. U. S. Congress. Senate Reports on Public Bills, 85th Congress, 2nd Session. 2242. National Defense Education Act. Report from Committee on Labor and Public Welfare together with individual and minority views. . . August 8, 1958, 55.

55. *Ibid*., 76.

56. U. S. Congress. House Committee on Education and Labor. To amend and extend the National Defense Education Act. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education on HR 6061, HR 9846 and similar bills. 88th Congress, 1st and 2nd Sessions. May 7, 1963 through March 5, 1964, 53.

57. U. S. Congress. House Committee on Education and Labor. 87th Congress, 1st Session. Hearings before the Joint Subcommittee on Education. HR 6774, HR 4253, HR 7378 and related bills to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act and for other purposes. Part I. Hearings held in Washington, D. C. June 1 and 2, 1961; and Part III. Hearings held in Washington, D. C. June 7,8,13, and 14, 1961. pp. 806-811.

58. Donald N. Bigelow and Lyman Legters, *NDEA Language and Area Centers: A Report on the First Five Years* (Washington, D. C., 1964), 45.

59. *Ibid*., 47.

60. U. S. Congress. House Education and Labor Committee. National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Administration of). Hearings before the Subcommittee on several titles contained in the Defense Education Act of 1958. February 19 and 20, 1959, pp. 70-71.

61. Bigelow, *First Five Years*, 19-20.

62. *Ibid*., 24.

63. The only other policy changes during the first five years were caused by experience in administering the Act and by pressure from the educational world. One was a decision to use summers more fully for language learning in language and area summer sessions contracted separately with the institutions concerned; the other was a decision to award some contracts to undergraduate institutions.

64. *Ibid*., 2.

65. Kenneth W. Mildenberger, "The Federal Government and the Universities," in Donald N. Bigelow and Lyman Legters, *The Annals - The Non-Western World in Higher Education* (Philadelphia, 1964), 27.

66. USDHEW, Office of Education, *Report on the National Defense Education Act, Fiscal Year 1963*, (Washington, 1964), 44.

67. Bigelow, *First Five Years*, 38.

68. Mildenberger, The Annals, 29.

69. Lyman H. Legters, "NDEA Support for Undergraduate Language and Area Studies," Liberal Education 51 (1965), 278-83.

70. George E. Taylor, "The Leadership of the Universities," in Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters, The Annals - The Non-Western World in Higher Education (Philadelphia, 1964), 7.

71. Ibid.

72. Bigelow, The First Five Years, 9-10.

73. "When it was conceded that area work lacked the 'hard core' and specific methodology by which it could challenge the disciplines on their own ground, it became apparent that the real argument turned neither on the appropriate way of carving up knowledge nor on the presumed benefits in the realm of research. Rather, the important question concerned the manner in which departments could be interrelated within a university structure to produce a set of integrated course offerings focusing on a specific world region. Mildenberger, The Annals, 28. However, the ghosts of claims for area studies as a challenge to the disciplines still appear from time to time; a relatively recent version is found in D. Lee Hamilton's "Modern Foreign Languages and NDEA, Title VI" Higher Education XIX (July 1963), 6, where the challenge to the disciplines is located, not in area studies, but in the "center concept."

74. Ibid., 29.

75. Ibid. An interesting related question is that of the impact of these programs on the Office of Education itself. See Education and World Affairs' The U. S. Office of Education: A New International Dimension. New York 1964.

76. Joseph Axelrod and Donald N. Bigelow, Resources for Language and Area Studies. A Report on an Inventory of the Language and Area Centers Supported by the National Defense Education Act of 1958. (Washington 1962), 1-2.

77. Ibid., 3.

78. Ibid., 13-14.

79. Ibid., 17.

80. For example: "Our visitors found that many. . . factors--elements outside the formal structure of a center--assumed an important role in establishing and maintaining a sense of unity at all centers"; they cite as a major factor the periodic luncheon or meeting of area staff; also a full-time bibliographer in contact with area faculty, physical proximity, a research program involving many center personnel or an extracurricular program for students involving many faculty. Ibid., 22.

81. Donald N. Bigelow, "The Center Concept and the Changing Curriculum," *Higher Education* XVIII (July 1962), 16.

82. See for example:

Yahya Armajani, "Four College Area Studies: A Cooperative Program in the Understanding of Other Cultures," AACB, 43 (1957), 14-22.

Jackson H. Bailey, "Non-Western Studies in the Small Liberal Arts College: An Experiment at Earlham and Antioch," *Liberal Education*, 47 (1961), 405-411.

Woodbridge Bingham, "An Integrated Approach to an All-Asia Survey Course," *AACB*, 44 (1958), 408-415.

Charles S. Blackton, "Undergraduate Area Studies in American Education," *Journal of General Education*, XII (1959), 158-163.

Robert F. Byrnes, *The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana* (Bloomington, 1959).

Marie T. Copp, "Foreign Area Courses in the Small College," *AAUPB*, 32 (1946), 562-67.

Martha L. Corry, "A Teacher's College Develops an Eastern Cultures Course," *Social Education*, XXIII (April 1959), 163-65.

Robert I. Crane, "The Role of the Introductory Asia Course in Undergraduate Education," *Journal of General Education*, XII (1959), 164-69.

Wm Theodore DeBary and Ainslie Embree (eds.), *Approaches to Asian Civilizations* (New York, 1964).

Ernest S. Griffith, "The Challenge of International Service," *Liberal Education*, 36 (1965), 32-37.

Teg C. Grondahl, "The American Universities Field Staff: A New Approach to the Study of Current Developments in Foreign Areas," *AACB*, 416 (1955), 389-396.

Irmgard Johnson, "Oriental Literature in General Education," *Journal of Higher Education*, 31 (1960), 121-26.

Walter G. Langlois, "An Honors Program and the Growth of Asian Studies," *Journal of Higher Education*, 33 (1962), 237-43.

James T. C. Liu, "An Orientation Course on Asian Civilizations," *Journal of General Education*, 10 (1957), 228-35.

McKim Marriott, "An Indian Civilization Course," in David G. Mandelbaum, Gabriel W. Lasker, and Ethel M. Albert, *The Teaching of Anthropology* (Berkeley, 1963), 203-16.

Ward Morehouse, "Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education," *Journal of General Education*, XI (1958), 125-40; "Foreign Area Studies in New York Schools and Colleges," *School and Society*, 91 (1963), 280-82; "The Pinebrook Experiment," *Liberal Education*, 50 (1964), 526-36.

Rev. W. E. O'Donnell, "Four College Area Studies," National Catholic Education Association, 60 (February 1964), 12-17.

Don Peretz, "Cooperative Faculty Seminar in Far Eastern Art and Culture," *Liberal Education*, 51 (1965), 497-503.

Earl Swisher, *Asiatic Studies Program at the University of Colorado* (Boulder, 1950).

John M. Thompson, "Non-Western Studies in Undergraduate Education," *The Teachers College Journal*, 34 (March 1963), 148-52.

New Paltz College of Education, "A View of Africa in a College Curriculum," *Social Education*, 24 (1960), 123-24.

82. (cont.)
Eugene W. Boardman (ed.), Asian Studies in Liberal Education (Washington, 1959).
Ward Morehouse (ed.), Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges (Washington, 1961).

83. General writings on area studies include:
William W. Brickman, "Asian and African Education," School and Society, 88 (1960), 340.
George F. Donovan, "More Area Studies for American Catholic Colleges and Universities," National Catholic Education Association Bulletin, 52 (November 1955), 7-18.
Arthur F. Engelbert, "Culture Area Programs for Liberal Arts Colleges," AACB, 44 (1958), 322-24.
Warren L. Hickman, "Retooling for a New Liberal Arts Program," Liberal Education, 50 (1964), 22-27.
Ward Morehouse, "Adding a New Dimension to Liberal Education," Liberal Education, 46 (1960), 380-87.
Jacob Neusner, "University Studies in Minority Cultures," Liberal Education, 50 (1964), 202-266.
F. K. Schaefer, "Area Study and General Education," The School Review, 53 (1945), 90-97.
Pedro C. M. Teichert, "The Importance of Foreign Area Studies: Latin American Economics - A Case Study," Journal of Higher Education, 29 (1958), 23-30.

84. H. G. Creel (ed.), Chinese Civilization in Liberal Education (Chicago, 1959).
Wm Theodore DeBary, "Asian Studies for Undergraduates," Journal of Higher Education, 30 (1959), 1-7; "Oriental Classics in General Education," Journal of General Education, XII (1959), 3-8.
Stephen N. Hay, "The Chicago and the Columbia Readings Compared," in Milton Singer (ed.), Introducing India in Liberal Education (Chicago, 1957), 200-04.
Journal of General Education, XII (January 1959), 1-49. (Presentation of differences between Columbia and Chicago approaches.)
Donald Keene, "The Tale of Genji in a General Education," Journal of General Education, XII (1959), 9-14.
Milton Singer, "Chicago's Non-Western Civilizations Program," Journal of General Education, XII (1959), 22-23. Introducing India in Liberal Education (Chicago, 1957).

85. H. G. Creel, "Chinese Culture and Liberal Education," Journal of General Education, XII (1959), 21.

86. W. T. DeBary, "Education for a World Community," Liberal Education, 50 (1964), 437.

87. Ibid., 441.

88. William Hallo, "The Place of Oriental Studies in a University Curriculum," JHE, 27 (1956), 11-16.

89. Ibid., 15.

90. Kennedy, The Classical Journal, 158 (January 1963), 157.

91. Ibid.

92. Ibid.

93. Ibid., 157-158.

94. Ibid., 158-159. (See also Lewis B. Mayher's fears that these developments will put an end to liberal arts education altogether in "Liberal Arts and the Changing Structure of Higher Education," Liberal Arts, 51 (1965), 366-378.

95. Fred Cole, International Relations in Institutions of Higher Education in the South (Washington D. C., 1958).
Cora DuBois, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States (Washington D. C., 1956).
C. Dale Fuller, Training of Specialists in International Relations (Washington D. C., 1957).
John Gange, University Research on International Affairs (Washington D. C., 1958).
Cyril O. Houle and Charles A. Nelson, The University, the Citizen and World Affairs (Washington D. C., 1956).
Richard N. Swift, World Affairs and the College Curriculum (Washington D. C., 1959).
Howard E. Wilson, American College Life as Education in World Outlook (Washington D. C., 1956).
Howard E. and Florence H. Wilson, American Higher Education and World Affairs (Washington D. C., 1963).

96. Committee on the University and World Affairs, The University and World Affairs (New York, 1960), 2.

97. Ibid., 3.

98. Ibid., 34.

99. Ibid., 5.

100. Ibid., 50.

101. That it did not encourage university programs on politically critical areas such as Tibet, for which universities have "insufficient educational reasons to justify half the cost of operation," and that it penalizes the institution which "extended itself to provide the maximum area studies program it could afford before the Act went into effect." Ibid., 61.

102. Wilson & Wilson, The University Looks Abroad (New York, 1963).

103. A sensible discussion of the dangers of these new activities for "the integrity of the educational enterprise" is found in Robert M. Rosenzweig, "Universities and the Foreign Assistance Program," *JHE* 35 (1964), 359-366.

104. John W. Gardner, *AID and the Universities* (New York, 1964) and *The U. S. Office of Education: A New International Dimension*, *EWA* 1964.

105. See for example Louis Morton, "National Security and Area Studies. . ." *JHE* 34 (1963), 142-47.

106. Gardner, *op.cit.*, 12-14.

107. Two small Association of American Colleges volumes of collected papers on the teaching of Asia published in 1959 and 1961 and clearly directed at the colleges are among the earliest indicators of the shift of focus to the colleges. (Eugene Boardman (ed.), *Asian Studies in Liberal Education* (Washington, 1959) and Ward Morehouse, (ed.), *Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges* (Washington, 1961).)

108. *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College*. A Report of the Commission on International Understanding, Association of American Colleges (Washington, 1964), 7. Findings in report summarized in D. Lee Hamilton, "Non-Western Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges," *School and Society* 93 (April 17, 1965), 244-49.

109. *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College*, *ibid.*, 45.

110. See also the 21 cooperative programs in Non-Western Studies listed in Wayne W. Anderson's *Cooperation Within American Higher Education* (Washington, 1964), 49-52.

111. *The College and World Affairs* (New York, 1964), 65.

112. *Ibid.*, 32.

113. Response from twenty smaller institutions involved in cooperative programs to our questionnaire indicated heavy reliance on Foundation support for this type of activity.

114. In a discussion of the role of American colleges and universities in aiding African educational development at the 1961 meeting of the Association for African Studies, much concern over the entrance of smaller institutions into the field of aiding African sister institutions was expressed. *African Studies Bulletin* IV (December, 1961), 2-4.

115. "Princeton University Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States: A Guide for High School and College Programs," *Educational Record* 47 (1966), 231.

116. *Ibid.*, 232.

117. Models of what can be done are found in the writings of Robert M. Byrnes and John Thompson on Indiana. Note 73 infra.

118. Merle Kling, "Area Studies and Comparative Politics: The Latin American Experience." Paper delivered at the 1963 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 4-7, 1963, 21 pp. mimeo.

119. Conrad C. Reining, "The Interdisciplinary Effect in African Studies," in D. N. Bigelow and Lyman Legters, The Non-Western World in Higher Education, The Annals 356 (Philadelphia, 1964), 104;
Philip Curtin, "Third Conference on African History and Archaeology," African Studies Bulletin IV (October, 1961), 10-11;
Philip Curtin, "Comment: African Art and African History," ASB V (May 1962), 26;
James S. Coleman, "Comment: African Arts and Political Science," ASB V (May 1962), 27-28;
see also the discussion in the "Report of the Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association," ASB III (March 1960), 18-19;
Joseph H. Greenbery, "Interdisciplinary Perspectives in African Linguistic Research," ASB IX (April 1966), 8-23.

120. Martin Deming Lewis, "How Many Histories Should We Teach?--Asia and Africa in a Liberal Education," Liberal Arts 48 (1962), 357-65. Milton Singer in The Annals; "Teaching of Indian Civilization and Chinese Studies," Chicago Conferences.

121. Felix M. Keesing, "Problems of Integrating Humanities and Social Science Approaches in Far Eastern Studies," Far Eastern Quarterly XIV (1955), 161.

122. Keesing, ibid., 161.

123. Ibid., 163.

124. John K. Fairbank, "A Note of Ambiguity: Asian Studies in America," Journal of Asian Studies XIX (1959), 5.

125. ASB VII (December 1964), 46.

126. Reining, op.cit., 101-103.

127. An ASB analysis of membership in 1960 showed 72 anthropologists, 62 political scientists, and membership from all other disciplines under 35 apiece. ASB III (March 1960), 28; Melvin Fox of the Ford Foundation had complained to the second annual meeting of the Association in 1959 that anthropology had been the major disciplinary source of all Ford awards for African studies to that date, receiving some 30% of all grants, and that even "after six years of trying to stimulate the interest of other disciplines, approximately half of the awards went to anthropologists" in 1959. "Report of the Second Annual Meeting" ASBII (December 1959), 22.

128. Reining, *op.cit.*, 103. See also the recommendations for elaborating the organizational structure of the Association put forward by prominent Africanists attending the first national conference on the teaching of African Languages and Area Studies, John G. Bordie (ed.), *National Conference on the Teaching of African Languages and Area Studies* (Washington, 1960), 61.

129. Frederic R. Wickert, "American Universities and Africa," *ASB* III (December 1960), 24-40.

130. *ASB* IX (April 1966), 38-67.

131. Members of that organization have been greatly concerned about their posture as foreign policy "experts," however. Much effort has been expended at recent annual meetings upon the drafting of statements on U. S. policy in Southeast Asia. Rumblings of discontent at the ambiguous position of Asia scholars may be found in Fairbank, *ibid.*, 4-5.

132. Greenberg, *ibid.*, 8-9.

133. Richard M. Morse, "The Challenge for Foreign Area Studies," *The Educational Record* 47 (1966), 238.

134. *Ibid.*, 239.

135. *Ibid.*, 238.

136. Homer D. Babbidge and Robert M. Rosenzweig, *The Federal Interest in Higher Education* (New York, 1962), 120.

137. *Ibid.*, 122

138. Fairbank, "A Note of Ambiguity," 4.

139. *Ibid.*, 5.

140. Robert I. Crane, "The Role of Coordinating Agencies and of Inter-University Cooperation in Strengthening South Asian Studies," in Richard Lambert, *Resources for South Asian Area Studies in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1962), 238-9.

141. Bigelow and Legters, *NDEA: The First Five Years*, p. 21.

142. Eugene P. Boardman (ed.), *Asian Studies in Liberal Education* (Washington, 1959), 10.

143. Ward Morehouse, "The Challenge of Intellectual Provincialism in the Colleges," *The Educational Record* 47 (1966), 263-5.

144. *Ibid.*, 266.

145. Ward Morehouse, "What Should Be the Role of Area Programs in the 60's?" Current Issues in Higher Education - Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual National Conference on Higher Education (Washington D.C., 1960), 192-93.

146. Ibid., 193.

147. Some supporting evidence is found in Dexter Perkins and John L. Snell, The Education of Historians in the United States (New York, 1962), which shows that the percentage of new Ph.D.'s in fields of African and Asian history was smaller in 1955-59 (3.8% of all Ph.D.'s granted in that period) than in 1873-1935 (5% of all Ph.D.'s granted in that period); and that increases in courses and enrollments in foreign area history courses has been moderate at best. See pp. 31, 74, 76, 119-22.

148. Babbidge and Rosenzweig, op.cit., 117.

149. Singer, "The Social Sciences in Non-Western Studies," The Annals, 33.

150. Mildenberger, "The Federal Government and the Universities," The Annals, 29.

Bibliography

Books and Monographs

Anderson, Wayne W. Cooperation within American Higher Education. Washington, D. C., 1964.

Babbidge, Homer D., Jr. and Robert M. Rosenzweig. The Federal Interest in Higher Education. New York, 1962.

Bennett, Wendell C. Area Studies in American Universities. New York, 1951.

Bigelow, Donald N. and Lyman Legters. NDEA Language and Area Centers: A Report on the First Five Years. Washington, D. C., 1964.

Bigelow, Donald and Lyman Legters (eds.). The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, - The Non-Western World in Higher Education, Vol. 306. Philadelphia, 1964.

Boardman, Eugene P. (ed.). Asian Studies in Liberal Education. Washington, D. C., 1959.

Byrnes, Robert. The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana. Bloomington, 1959.

Carter, Edward C. (ed.). China and Japan in Our University Curricula. New York, 1929.

Cole, Fred. International Relations in Institutions of Higher Education in the South. Washington, D. C., 1958.

The College and World Affairs. New York, 1964. (Distributed by Education and World Affiars.)

Committee of the American Historical Association on the Planning of Research. Historical Scholarship in America: Needs and Opportunities. New York, 1932.

Creel, H. G. (ed.). Chinese Civilization in Liberal Education. Chicago, 1959. (Proceedings of a conference held at the University of Chicago, November 2,8,29, 1958.)

DeBary, W. T. and Ainslie Embree (eds.). Approaches to Asian Civilizations. New York, 1964.

DuBois, Cora. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D. C., 1956.

Fairbank, Wilma. Directory of Organizations in America Concerned with China. Washington, D. C., 1942.

Fenton, William N. *Area Studies in American Universities*. Washington, D. C., 1947.

Fuller, C. Dale. *Training of Specialists in International Relations*. Washington, D. C., 1957.

Gardner, Charles S. *Chinese Studies in America: A Survey of Resources and Facilities - I: Eastern Canada and New England*. Washington, D. C., 1935.

Gardner, John W. *AID and the Universities*. New York, 1964.

Gibb, H. A. R. *Area Studies Reconsidered*. London, 1963.

Griffin Eldon. *Progress of Chinese Studies in the United States of America - American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin #11.* Washington, D. C., May 1931.

Hall, Robert B. *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences*. New York, 1947.

Houle, Cyril O. and Charles A. Nelson. *The University, The Citizen, and World Affairs*. Washington, D. C., 1956.

Indic Studies in America. *American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin #28*. Washington, D. C., 1939.

Joint Committee on Southern Asia of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Sciences Research Council. *Southern Asia Studies in the United States: A Survey and a Plan*. Philadelphia, 1951.

Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College, Washington, D. C., 1964. (A Report of the Commission on International Understanding, Association of American Colleges).

Perkins, Dexter, and John L. Snell. *The Education of Historians in the United States*. New York, 1962.

Promotion of Chinese Studies. *American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin #10*. Washington, D. C., 1929.

Singer, Milton (ed.). *Introducing India in Liberal Education*. Chicago, 1957.

Steward, Julian H. *Area Research: Theory and Practice - Social Science Research Council Bulletin no. 63*. New York, 1950.

Swift, Richard N. *World Affairs and the College Curriculum*. Washington, D.C., 1959.

Swisher, Earl. *Asiatic Studies Program at the University of Colorado*. Boulder, Colorado, 1950.

The U. S. Office of Education: A New International Dimension. New York, 1964. (A Report to the U. S. Commissioner of Education.)

Wagley, Charles. Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas. New York, 1948.

Wilson, Howard E. American College Life as Education in World Outlook. Washington, D. C., 1956.

Wilson, Howard E. and Florence H. Wilson. American Higher Education and World Affairs. Washington D. C., 1963.

________. The University Looks Abroad. New York, 1963.

Documents

U. S. Congress. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. 85th Congress, 2nd Session. National Defense Education Act of 1958. A summary and analysis of the Act. September 5, 1958.

U. S. Congress. House Education and Labor Committee. National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Administration of). Hearings before the Subcommittee on several titles contained in the Defense Education Act of 1958. February 19 and 20, 1959.

U. S. Congress. House Committee on Education and Labor. 87th Congress, 1st Session. Hearings before the Joint Subcommittee on Education. HR 6774, HR 4253, HR 7378 and related bills to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act and for other purposes. Part I. Hearings held in Washington, D. C. June 1 and 2, 1961; and Part III. Hearings held in Washington, D. C. June 7, 8, 13, and 14, 1961.

U. S. Congress. House Committee on Education and Labor. To amend and extend the National Defense Education Act. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education, on HR 6061, HR 9846 and similar bills. 88th Congress, 1st and 2nd Sessions. May 7, 1963 through March 5, 1964.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Report of the National Defense Education Act, Fiscal Year 1963. Washington, D. C., 1964.

Articles

Armajani, Yahya, "Four College Area Studies: A Cooperative Program in the Understanding of Other Cultures," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 43 (1957), 14-22.

Bailey, Jackson H., "Non-Western Studies in the Small Liberal Arts College: An Experiment at Earlham and Antioch," Liberal Education, 47 (1961), 405-411.

Beckmann, George, "The Role of the Foundations," in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science - The Non-Western World in Higher Education*, 365. Philadelphia, 1965. 12-22.

Bigelow, Donald N., "A Backdoor to the Future," *Liberal Arts*, 49 (1963), 481-87.

Bigelow, Donald N., "The Center Concept and the Changing Curriculum," *Higher Education*, XVIII (July 1962), 12-16.

Bingham, Woodbridge, "An Integrated Approach to an All-Asia Survey Course," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, 44 (1958), 408-415.

Blackton, Charles S., "Undergraduate Area Studies in American Education," *Journal of General Education*, XII (1959), 158-163.

Brickman, William W., "Asian and African Education," *School and Society*, 88 (1960), 340.

Brown, W. Norman, "Development of South Asia Studies in the United States, 1951-1961," in Richard Lambert, *Resources for South Asian Area Studies in the U. S.* Philadelphia, 1961.

Brown, W. Norman, "India and Humanistic Studies in America," in *Indic Studies in America*. *American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin*, #28. Washington, D. C., 1939. 1-26.

Cahnman, Werner J., "Outline of a Theory of Area Studies," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 38 (1948), 233-43.

Cameron, Meribeth E., "Far Eastern Studies in the United States," *Far Eastern Quarterly*, 7 (1948), 115-135.

Cameron, Maribeth E., "The Integration of Asian Studies into the American Undergraduate Curriculum," in W. T. DeBary and Ainslie Embree (eds.), *Approaches to Asian Civilizations*. New York, 1964. 253-62.

Coleman, James S., "Comment: African Arts and Political Science," *African Studies Bulletin*, V (May 1962).

Copp, Marie T., "Foreign Area Courses in the Small College," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 32 (1946), 562-67.

Corry, Martha L., "A Teacher's College Develops an Eastern Cultures Course," *Social Education*, XXIII (April 1959), 163-65.

Crane, Robert I., "The Role of Coordinating Agencies and of Inter-University Cooperation in Strengthening South Asian Area Studies," in Richard Lambert, *Resources for South Asian Area Studies in the U. S.* Philadelphia, 1962.

__________. "The Role of the Introductory Asia Course in Undergraduate Education," *Journal of General Education*, XII (1959), 164-69.

Curtin, Philip D., "Comment: African Art and African History," African Studies Bulletin, V (May 1962).

________. "Third Conference on African History and Archaeology," African Studies Bulletin, IV (October 1961).

DeBary, W. T., "Education for a World Community," Liberal Education, 50 (1964), 437-457.

DeBary, W. T., "Oriental Classics in General Education," Journal of General Education, XII (1959), 3-8.

Diekhoff, J. S., "The Mission and the Method of Army Language Teaching," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 31 (1945), 606-20.

Donovan, George F., "More Area Studies for American Catholic Colleges and Universities," National Catholic Education Association Bulletin, 52 (November, 1955), 7-18.

Engelbert, Arthur F., "Culture Area Programs for Liberal Arts Colleges," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 44 (1958), 322-324.

Fairbank, John K., "A Note of Ambiguity: Asian Studies in America," Journal of Asian Studies, XIX (1959), 3-9.

Fenton, W. N., "The Integration of Geography and Anthropology in Army Area Study Curricula," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 32 (1946), 696-706.

Ferguson, Charles A., "Language Study and the Middle East," in Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science - The Non-Western World in Higher Education, 356. Philadelphia, 1964.

Graves, Mortimer, "Seminar in Far Eastern Studies," Pacific Affairs, 5 (1932), 1072-78.

________, "Two Experiments in Education," American Scholar, 3 (1934), 359-60.

Greenberg, Joseph H., "Interdisciplinary Perspectives in African Linguistic Research," African Studies Bulletin, IX (April 1966), 8-23.

Griffith, Ernest S., "The Challenge of International Service," Liberal Education, 36 (1965), 32-37.

Grondahl, Teg C., "The American Universities Field Staff: A New Approach to the Study of Current Developments in Foreign Areas," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 416 (1955), 389-396.

Hall, Robert A., Jr., "Progress and Reaction in Modern Language Teaching," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 31 (1945), 22-30.

Hallo, William W., "The Place of Oriental Studies in a University Curriculum," Journal of Higher Education, 27 (1956), 11-16.

Hamilton, D. Lee, "Non-Western Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges," School and Society, 93 (April 17, 1965), 244-49.

Hay, Stephen N., "The Chicago and the Columbia Readings Compared," in Milton Singer (ed.), Introducing India in Liberal Education. Chicago, 1957. 200-204.

Hickman, Warren L., "Retooling for a New Liberal Arts Program," Liberal Education, 50 (1964), 22-27.

Hyneman, Charles S., "The Wartime Area and Language Courses," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 31 (1945), 434-447.

Johnson, Irmgard, "Oriental Literature in General Education," Journal of Higher Education, 31 (1960), 121-26.

Journal of General Education, XII (January, 1959), 1-49. (Presentation of the differences between the Columbia and Chicago approaches.)

Keesing, Felix M., "Problems of Integrating Humanities and Social Science Approaches in Far Eastern Studies," Far Eastern Quarterly XIV (1955), 161-68.

Kennedy, George, "Non-Western Studies: A Challenge to the Classics," The Classical Journal, 158, 4 (January 1963), 157-59.

Kling, Merle, "Area Studies and Comparative Politics: The Latin American Experience," paper delivered at the 1963 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association (September 1963).

Langlois, Walter G., "An Honors Program and the Growth of Asian Studies," Journal of Higher Education, 33 (1962), 237-43.

LaTourette, Kenneth S., "The Far East in American Education," School and Society, 31 (1930), 69-74.

_________, "Far Eastern Studies in the U. S.: Retrospect and Prospect," Far Eastern Quarterly, XV (1955), 3-11.

Legters, Lyman H., "NDEA Support for Undergraduate Language and Area Studies," Liberal Education, 51 (1965), 278-83.

Liu, James T. C. "An Orientation Course on Asian Civilizations," Journal of General Education, 10 (1957), 228-35.

Marriott, McKim, "An Indian Civilization Course," in David G. Mandelbaum, Gabriel W. Lasker and Ethel M. Albert, The Teaching of Anthropology. Berkeley, 1963.

Mayhew, Lewis B., "The Liberal Arts and the Changing Structure of Higher Education," Liberal Arts, 51 (1965), 366-78.

McGrath, Earl J. "Area Studies," Journal of Higher Education, 22 (1951), 236-42, 283-84.

Mildenberger, Kenneth W., "The Federal Government and the Universities," in Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters (eds.), The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 356. Philadelphia, 1964. 23-29.

Morehouse, Ward, "Adding a New Dimension to Liberal Education," Liberal Education, 46 (1960), 380-87.

__________, "Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education," Journal of General Education, XI (1958), 125-40.

__________, "The Challenge of Intellectual Provincialism in the Colleges," The Educational Record, 47 (Spring, 1966), 263-74.

__________, "Foreign Area Studies in New York Schools and Colleges," School and Society, 91 (1963), 280-82.

__________, "The Pinebrook Experiment," Liberal Education, 50 (1964), 526-36.

__________, "What Should be the Role of Area Programs in the 60's?" Current Issues in Higher Education - Proceedings of the 15th Annual National Conference on Higher Education. Washington D. C., 1960. 190-93.

Morse, Richard M., "The Challenge for Foreign Area Studies," Educational Record, 47 (1966), 234-43.

Morton, Louis, "National Security and Area Studies: The Intellectual Response to the Cold War," Journal of Higher Education, 34 (1963), 142-47.

Murdock, George P., "The Conceptual Basis of Area Research," World Politics, II (1950), 571-78.

Neusner, Jacob, "University Studies in Minority Cultures," Liberal Education, 50 (1964), 202-06.

New Paltz College of Education, "A View of Africa in a College Curriculum," Social Education, 24 (1960), 123-24.

O'Donnell, Rev. W. E., "Four College Area Studies," National Catholic Education Bulletin, 60 (February 1964), 12-17.

Pei, Mario A., "A Modern Language Teacher Replies," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 31 (1945), 409-17.

Peretz, Don, "Cooperative Faculty Seminar in Far Eastern Art and Culture," Liberal Education, 51 (1965), 497-503.

Price, Maurice T. "Making Foreign-Area Curriculums Feasible," The Educational Record, 28 (1947), 429-43.

__________, "The Next Step in Oriental Studies in Our American Universities and Colleges," The Historical Outlook, XXIII (1932), 113-117.

__________, "A Proposal for Foreign-Area Courses," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 31 (1945), 648-57.

"Princeton University Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States: A Guide for High School and College Programs," Educational Record, 47 (1966), 229-83.

Rauch, Jerome S., "Area Institute Programs and African Studies," Journal of Negro Education, 24 (1955), 409-25.

Reining, Conrad C., "The Interdisciplinary Effect in African Studies," in Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science - The Non-Western World in Higher Education, 356. Philadelphia, 1964.

"Report of the Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association," African Studies Bulletin, II (March 1960).

"Report of the Second Annual Meeting," African Studies Bulletin, II (December 1959), 13-42.

Schaefer, F. K., "Area Study and General Education," The School Review, 53 (1945), 90-97.

Singer, Milton, "Chicago's Non-Western Civilizations Program," Journal of General Education, XII (1959), 22-23.

__________, "The Social Sciences in Non-Western Studies," in Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science - The Non-Western World in Higher Education, 356. Philadelphia, 1964.

Taylor, George E., "The Leadership of the Universities," in Donald Bigelow and Lyman Legters (eds.), The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science - The Non-Western World in Higher Education, 356. Philadelphia, 1964.

Teichert, Pedro C. M., "The Importance of Foreign Area Studies: Latin American Economics - A Case Study," Journal of Higher Education, 29 (1958), 23-30.

Thompson, John M., "Non-Western Studies in Undergraduate Education," The Teachers College Journal, 34 (March 1963), 148-52.

Wickert, Frederic R., "American Universities and Africa," African Studies Bulletin, III (December 1960), 24-40.

Appendix

GROWTH OF PRIVATE AND NDEA SUPPORTED FOREIGN AREA PROGRAMS, 1951-1964

Region	Programs												
	1951	1956		1959			1962			1964			1965
	Major Programs	Major Programs[b]	State Dept. Fig.	Fed. Support[e]	Major Programs	State Dept. Fig.	Fed. Support[f]	Major Programs	State Dept. Fig.	Fed. Support[g]	Major Programs	State Dept. Fig.	Fed. Support[h]
Africa	1	4	6	1	5	6	4	12	13	5	16[a]	16	8
Asia (general)		16	24		6	6		12	16		9	11	1
East Asia[c]	8			5	15	17	13	12	12	13	19	19	22
South Asia	1	4	6	3	6	12	6	11	14	7	11	18	11
Southeast Asia	2	3	9	1	6		3			3	4		3
Latin America	6	14	28	2	16	19	7	27	29	7	28	30	12
Near East	2	7	12	3	10	13	8	10	18	8	16	18	10
Soviet Union	5	11	19	4	15	19	11	23	34	12	29	35	18
Eastern Europe[d]		5											

[a] Total from the African Studies Bulletin

[b] Applying Bennett's criteria to State Department figures

[c] Includes Asian-Slavic

[d] Includes Uralic-Altaic

[e] For academic year 1959-60

[f] For academic year 1961-62

[g] For academic year 1963-64

[h] For academic year 1964-65

For Sources: see next page.

Sources for the Appendix Table

Sources for East Asia and South Asia Statistics:

Bennett, Wendell C. Area Studies in American Universities. New York, 1951.

Department of State, Office of Intelligence Research, External Research Staff. Area Study Programs in American Universities. Washington, D. C., 1956.

Department of State, External Research Division. Area Study Programs in American Universities. Washington, D. C., 1959.

Department of State, External Research Staff. Language and Area Study Programs in American Universities. Washington, D. C., 1964.

The African Studies Bulletin, 1964.

Bigelow, Donald & Lyman Legters. NDEA Language and Area Centers: A Report on the First Five Years. Washington, D. C., 1964.